
CASE NO. 21-01239

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re: Orion Healthcorp, Inc.

Debtor.

**2 RIVER TERRACE APARTMENT 12J, LLC
APPELLANT**

v.

**HOWARD M. EHRENBURG IN HIS CAPACITY AS LIQUIDATING
TRUSTEE OF ORION HEALTHCORP, INC.**

APPELLEE

On Appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court, Eastern District of New York
Adv. Proc. No. 20-08051(AST)

APPELLEE'S APPENDIX

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
Ilan D. Scharf, Esq.
Jeffrey P. Nolan, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
780 Third Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 561-7700
Facsimile: (212) 561-7777

Counsel for the Appellee/Plaintiff
Howard M. Ehrenberg in his capacity as
Liquidating Trustee of Orion Healthcorp, Inc., et al.
Appendix to Appellee's Answering Brief

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appx.	Description	Page #s
1	Transcript of hearing on <i>Motion for Summary Judgment</i> before the Bankruptcy Court, January 21, 2021	1580-1659
2	Transcript of Notice of Ruling on <i>Motion for Summary Judgment Ruling Hearing</i> before the Bankruptcy Court, February 9, 2021	1660-1693
3	Joint Statement Of Plaintiff And Defendant Of Uncontroverted Facts With Reference To Plaintiff's Motion For Summary Judgment Or In The Alternative Summary Adjudication	1694-1712

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 21, 2021

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

/s/Jeffrey P. Nolan
PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
Ilan D. Scharf, Esq.
Jeffrey P. Nolan, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
780 Third Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 561-7700
Facsimile: (212) 561-7777

Counsel for the Appellee/Plaintiff
Howard M. Ehrenberg in his capacity as
Liquidating Trustee of Orion Healthcorp, Inc., et al.

Page 1

1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3 Case No. 18-71748

4 - - - - - x

5 In the Matter of:

6 ORION HEALTHCORP, INC.,
7 Debtor.

8 - - - - - x

9 Adv. Case No. 20-08042-ast

10 - - - - - x

11 HOWARD M. EHRENBERG IN HIS CAPACITY AS LIQUIDATING TRUSTEE
12 OF ORION HEALTHCORP, INC.,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 HOWARD M. SCHOOR,

16 Defendants.

17 - - - - - x

18 Adv. Case No. 20-08038-ast

19 - - - - - x

20 EHRENBERG,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 EVICORE,

24 Defendant.

25 - - - - - x

Page 2

1 **Adv. Case No. 20-08049-ast**

2 -----x

3 **EHRENBERG,**

4 **Plaintiff,**

5 **v.**

6 **WALIA, et al.,**

7 **Defendant.**

8 -----x

9 **Adv. Case No. 20-08051-ast**

10 -----x

11 **EHRENBERG,**

12 **Plaintiff,**

13 **v.**

14 **SARTISON, et al.,**

15 **Defendant.**

16 -----x

17 **Adv. Case No. 20-08052-ast**

18 -----x

19 **EHRENBERG,**

20 **Plaintiff,**

21 **v.**

22 **ABRUZZI INVESTMENTS, et al.,**

23 **Defendant.**

24 -----x

25

Page 3

1 **United States Bankruptcy Court**
2 **290 Federal Plaza**
3 **Central Islip, New York 11722**

4

5 **January 21, 2021**

6 **10:01 AM**

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 **B E F O R E :**

22 **HON ALAN S. TRUST**

23 **U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE**

24

25 **ECRO: UNKNOWN**

Page 4

1 HEARING re 42 Motion for Summary Judgment Filed by Plaintiff

2 Howard M. Ehrenberg

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

Page 5

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2

3 PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

4 Attorneys for the Trustee, Howard M. Ehrenberg

5 780 Third Avenue, 34th Floor

6 New York, NY 10017

7

8 BY: JEFFREY NOLAN (TELEPHONICALLY)

9 ILAN SCHAFER (TELEPHONICALLY)

10

11 PARLATORE LAW GROUP LLP

12 Attorneys for 2 River Terrace

13 One World Trade Center, Suite 8500

14 New York, New York 10007

15

16 BY: MARYANN HADDEN (TELEPHONICALLY)

17

18 GIORDANO HALLERAN & CIESLA

19 Attorneys for Howard Schoor

20 125 Half Mile Road, PO Box 190

21 Middletown, NJ 07748

22

23 BY: DONALD CAMPBELL (TELEPHONICALLY)

24

25

Page 6

1 ROSENBERG & PITTINSKY, LLP

2 Attorneys for Board of Managers of Riverhouse Condo

3 232 Madison Avenue, Suite 906

4 New York, New York 10016

5

6 BY: LAWRENCE PITTINSKY (TELEPHONICALLY)

7

8 ROSEN & ASSOCIATES P.C.

9 Attorneys for Arvind Walia

10 747 Third Avenue

11 New York, NY 10017-2803

12

13 BY: SANFORD ROSEN (TELEPHONICALLY)

14 PARIS GYPARAKIS (TELEPHONICALLY)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 | PROCEEDINGS

2 CLERK: Good morning. I am Yvette Mills,
3 Courtroom Deputy for Chief Judge Alan S. Trust presiding.

4 These hearings are being recorded. Please speak clearly.

I just want everyone starting with the Debtors' attorney to just give your appearance and who you represent.

7 MR. NOLAN: Good morning. Jeff Nolan from
8 Pachulski Stang & Ziehl, along with Ilan Scharf,
9 representing the Trustee, Howard Ehrenberg.

10 CLERK: Donald Campbell?

11 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. Donald Campbell on behalf of
12 Howard Schoor, S-C-H-O-O-R.

CLERK: Could I have Joseph Orbach?

14 MR. ORBACH: Joseph Orbach. I'm just on a listen
15 only. I represent Howard Ehrenberg, but not in any of the
16 adversaries proceeding today.

17 CLERK: No problem. Lauren Pittinsky. Maryann
18 Hadden.

19 MS. HADDEN: Maryann Hadden from Parlatore Law
20 Group, LLP, on behalf of 2 River Terrace.

21 MR. PITTINSKY: Lawrence Pittinsky, Rosenberg &
22 Pittinsky, on behalf of the Board of Managers of River House
23 Condominium.

24 CLERK: Sanford Rosen.

25 MR. ROSEN: Good morning. Sanford Rosen, Rosen &

Page 8

1 Associates PC, on behalf of Arvind Walia.

2 CLERK: And can I have the person whose phone
3 number is 917-809-0346?

4 MR. GYPARAKIS: Good morning. Paris Gyparakis,
5 Rosen & Associates, counsel to Arvind Walia.

6 CLERK: What was your name?

7 MR. GYPARAKIS: Paris Gyparakis, G-Y-P-A-R-A-K-I-
8 S.

9 CLERK: What was the first name?

10 MR. GYPARAKIS: Paris, like the city, P-A-R-I-S.

11 CLERK: And the last name?

12 MR. GYPARAKIS: G-Y-P-A-R-A-K-I-S.

13 CLERK: Okay, thank you. I believe we have all
14 the parties, Judge. Case No -- well, it's adversary
15 starting with 20-8042, Ehrenberg v. Howard Schoor.

16 MR. CAMPBELL: Schoor.

17 THE COURT: Take appearances, please.

18 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Good morning, Your Honor. Jeff
19 Nolan appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff, Howard Ehrenberg
20 in his capacity as a liquidating trustee.

21 MR. CAMPBELL: Good morning, Your Honor. Don
22 Campbell from the Law Firm of Giordano Halleran & Ciesla on
23 behalf of Defendant, Howard Schoor.

24 THE COURT: All right. As Ms. Mills did, I'm just
25 going to ask if everyone else will mute their line. If

Page 9

1 you're not involved in this hearing, please mute your line.

2 All right, Mr. Nolan.

3 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor. As the Court may
4 recall, this is an adversary. It's about \$160,000 at issue,
5 it's a fraudulent conveyance case under the Bankruptcy Code,
6 as well as under the New York Debt and Creditor Law.

7 We have a case management and discovery plan in
8 place; fact discovery was to be closed as of yesterday, and
9 expert designations are at the end of the month, and we have
10 gone forward with the depositions of the plaintiff.

11 As you may recall, the plaintiff also requested
12 that the Court allow the plaintiff to file a summary
13 judgment motion. We submitted a letter to the Court
14 approximately a month ago, and the Court directed that
15 counsel meet and confer and submit a joint statement of
16 uncontested facts, which the parties have done and have
17 submitted a joint statement of uncontested facts and it
18 should be before the Court.

19 I'll allow -- I know -- I got an email this
20 morning saying that the defendant wanted to address some
21 additional time. I'll leave that to my colleague and
22 opposing counsel for the defendant.

23 THE COURT: Let me ask, Mr. Nolan, before you toss
24 the baton so to speak. The letter that was submitted and
25 requested a pre-motion conference references New York DCL

Page 10

1 276. Is it the plaintiffs' contemplation that if you move
2 forward with summary judgment, it would solely be on an
3 actual intent of fraudulent transfer claim?

4 MR. NOLAN: No, Your Honor. We would also be
5 under 273 of the New York Debtor and Creditor Law, so it
6 would be a fraudulent, intentionally fraudulent transfer as
7 well as a constructively fraudulent transfer, as well as the
8 Bankruptcy Code within the 548.

9 THE COURT: All right. And so, I know you said
10 your designations under the scheduling agreement for experts
11 are later this week or later this -- well, later this week,
12 next week. Is it the intention of the plaintiff to submit
13 an expert opinion on solvency or insolvency on the relevant
14 dates of the transfers as part of the summary judgment
15 motion?

16 MR. NOLAN: Well, I was hoping that the Court
17 could -- okay, the immediate answer is, Your Honor, we would
18 be filing a motion for summary judgment. I think at this
19 point, since we're so close to the expert designation date,
20 that it would make sense to allow the expert report to be
21 exchanged and to allow just one, you know, bite at the apple
22 on summary judgment, which would incorporate all the
23 theories of liability under the Complaint.

24 THE COURT: All right. All right, thank you. Mr.
25 Campbell.

Page 11

1 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, Your Honor, good morning.
2 Donald Campbell.

3 Mr. Nolan is correct. We have issued a subpoena
4 to Merrill Lynch Bank of America. We received a phone call
5 yesterday from Bank of America requesting additional time to
6 respond to provide documents. We just sent a letter to Mr.
7 Nolan this morning asking if he would consent to a two-week
8 extension of discovery solely to provide Bank of America
9 additional time to provide those documents.

10 Those documents are a request for the transfers of
11 the funds that were loaned by Mr. Schoor and directed to a
12 Merrill Lynch account, and it's our hope that we're looking
13 for information with regards to the connection, if any,
14 between the debtor entities and this Merrill Lynch account,
15 so we'd ask for that short request.

16 And Mr. Nolan hasn't had an opportunity to consent
17 or not, but we'd ask for that short extension, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: All right. In terms of the
19 designations of experts which are coming up, is it the
20 defendants' intention to retain an expert on solvency?

21 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, Your Honor. We have not seen
22 the plaintiffs' expert report yet, but obviously, we'd look
23 to evaluate that and retain an expert to review and analyze
24 the trustee's report on insolvency at the time of the
25 transfers.

Page 12

1 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Mr. Nolan, let
2 me go back to you then. If I'm going to have competing
3 expert opinions on solvency at the relevant dates of the
4 transfers, wouldn't it be less expensive and potentially no
5 more time consuming to simply try the case rather than go
6 through a potentially expensive summary judgment process?

7 I've looked at the stipulated facts. It appears
8 to the Court that the parties have obviously attempted to
9 limit the issues that would need to be tried at the time of
10 trial. But unless there's an agreement on solvency or
11 insolvency of the transferor entity on the date of the
12 transfers, don't I end up trying the case on solvency
13 anyway?

14 MR. NOLAN: Well, Your Honor, the -- if it's an
15 intentionally fraudulent transfer, solvency is not an area
16 of inquiry. And what I think the facts that we stipulated
17 to show is that there is a promissory note between Mr.
18 Schoor, who was the neighbor of Mr. Parmar, and it says it's
19 a personal loan.

20 And in discovery, we asked for any documents
21 surrounding the loan, and everything that the plaintiff
22 received back, including the testimony of the defendant, is
23 that this was a personal loan made not for business purposes
24 and which Mr. Schoor continually over a period of five years
25 asked Mr. Parmar to honor his word as a friend, as a loan

Page 13

1 that was made in friendship.

2 And I think based on the fact that there's no
3 documents tying the loan that was given, and the fact that
4 it's undisputed that the money that was paid back was paid
5 back with the debtors' funds, that defendant can't simply
6 just rely on oral testimony from Mr. Schoor that says, well,
7 he told me that somewhere along the line, he was going to
8 use this for his business.

9 I think the case law in New York demands that
10 there be at least some documentation, (a) showing that it's
11 a valid antecedent debt and that it's an antecedent debt of
12 the debtor.

13 And then the most compelling of all, Your Honor,
14 on the fraudulent -- on intentional fraudulent conveyance
15 is, as the Court knows, under both the New York Debt
16 Creditor Law and the Bankruptcy Code, it's the intent of the
17 transferor that's at issue, which is Mr. Parmar.

18 And the plaintiff has undisputed evidence that
19 after this personal loan was given between Mr. Parmar and
20 Mr. Schoor and after the debtor paid back the debt with the
21 debtors' monies, Mr. Parmar and Mr. Chivukula, the CFO, went
22 back and created a fake consulting agreement, a consulting
23 agreement that I gave to Mr. Schoor at his deposition, and
24 he said "I didn't sign it, I've never been a consultant to
25 the debtor, I've never given any consulting services to any

Page 14

1 of Mr. Parmar's companies". And that's just per se evidence
2 of a fraudulent conveyance.

3 It was coded in the debtors' books and records as
4 professional fees, and Mr. Chivukula in an email to Mr.
5 Parmar even says, "Hey, we have to come up with some reason
6 for why we paid this loan back."

7 THE COURT: Mr. Nolan, you're now circling back to
8 my initial question to you, which was the trustee's
9 intending to move forward for summary judgment just on the
10 DCL 276 actual intent claim or more, because I understand
11 the narrow strike argument that you're making on the motion
12 that's not in front of me yet, it's actual intent 276 when
13 we're done here.

14 MR. NOLAN: Sure.

15 THE COURT: And if they're asking to do is move
16 for summary judgment on that one claim, I understand that;
17 that's narrow -- you might win, you might not. But to
18 broaden it out to include reasonably equivalent or lack of
19 reasonably equivalent value under constructive fraud claims;
20 that's a beast of a different nature.

21 So now I'm back to the first question I asked you,
22 which is, does the trustee want to file a summary judgment
23 motion while it's full summary judgment, it's only on the
24 276 issue.

25 MR. NOLAN: Your Honor, thank you for the

Page 15

1 clarification. I think that's correct. I think then we
2 could limit the single issue in front of the Court to be the
3 New York Debt and Creditor Law 276 cause of action.

4 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Campbell, you said
5 that you're waiting on some documents from Merrill Bank of
6 America, and I'll just treat those as documents that you
7 would want for response to a summary judgment -- to respond
8 to a summary judgment motion on the 276 actual intent claim.

9 Is there any other discovery that's owed or
10 outstanding that might relate to the actual intent claim?

11 MR. CAMPBELL: At this time, Your Honor, I don't
12 believe so. Of course, I haven't seen the Merrill Lynch
13 documents and it's possible that that could lead to
14 additional requests, but I think it's unlikely; however, I
15 don't -- I would be speculating if I know.

16 But based on Bank of America's voicemail message
17 they left me, it sounds like it may be voluminous, but I
18 just don't know, so I hope that's a sufficient answer, Your
19 Honor.

20 THE COURT: Okay, fair enough. So then let's
21 proceed on this basis. Relevant to this adversary
22 proceeding and some of the others that we're going to talk
23 about this morning, the Court is satisfied a trial date in
24 early June for some of these adversary proceedings or
25 potentially others that are not in front of me today.

Page 16

1 It would seem that given the good work that you
2 all have done on the stipulated facts, there's probably not
3 much more that would be necessary for the plaintiffs'
4 summary judgment motion and then obviously any response from
5 the defendant. I don't know at this point that I need a
6 reply because in a reply, I'm not going to consider any
7 evidence that wasn't submitted either through the
8 stipulation or the ultimate motion.

9 So I can set a schedule for you all that tracks
10 you toward a June 7 trial week setting, but also potentially
11 gets to resolution of the 276 issue before you all spend the
12 big money on expert witness. Now, you may be all ready to
13 do that, you may want to revisit your timeline, but I would
14 recommend that you all discuss whether or not you really
15 want to now spend the money on the timeline you're on for
16 experts if we're going to take a rifle shot on the 276.

17 Bu the Court has set aside -- Miss Mills, what is
18 the date in March that we're now using for Orion?

19 CLERK: I believe it's March --

20 THE COURT: Is it March 16th?

21 CLERK: Yes.

22 THE COURT: March 16th?

23 CLERK: Yeah, March 16th at 10:00.

24 THE COURT: All right. So what we can do is this
25 is since you all are obviously working cooperatively

Page 17

1 together, is for you all to come up with a submission
2 schedule that would have the summary judgment argued on
3 March 16th at 10:00 a.m.

4 My admonition to you all is I'm happy for you all
5 to agree to dates and deadlines that work for you
6 respectively, but I want to make sure that everything the
7 Court's being asked to look at is last submitted by March
8 9th, so that we have a week ahead of time.

9 So that should give the plaintiff time to go ahead
10 and get the summary judgment record ready, let the defendant
11 file the response in advance of March 9th. And again, I
12 don't know that I'm going to need a reply brief on these
13 issues, but if one of you believes it's critical to have it,
14 then just make sure that it's filed by no later than March
15 9th.

16 And again, recognizing that if summary judgment
17 were denied, you would be tilting toward a June 7 trial,
18 just recalibrate how you want to handle the expert deadlines
19 in the event -- this is capital I, capital F -- if the case
20 is resolved at summary judgment. Fair enough?

21 MR. NOLAN: Understood, Your Honor.

22 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: So then what I'll have you do is just
24 go ahead after -- go ahead and confer offline, and then just
25 submit a letter outlining the dates by which plaintiff shall

Page 18

1 file, defendant shall respond. I'll also order that once
2 it's submitted, but you know the outside date I'm looking at
3 is March 9th with an argument March 16th at 10:00 a.m.

4 For today's purposes, I'm going to adjourn the
5 pretrial conference over to the March 16 at 10:00 a.m.; that
6 gets it on that calendar. When the plaintiff files their
7 summary judgment motions, just want to make sure that you
8 then give notice of hearing for it for March 16th at 10:00
9 a.m.

10 As far as the additional time to get the documents
11 from Merrill and Bank of America, I'll take Mr. Nolan not
12 saying not to that as assent to that extension, so that will
13 be fine, Mr. Campbell.

14 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: All right. And also, to the extent
16 that you all modify the scheduling order that was previously
17 submitted to account for our discussion this morning about
18 summary judgment and expert witnesses, just reflect that in
19 the same letter to the Court to be so ordered.

20 We'll then issue the trial scheduling order that
21 will include these dates and deadlines in it so that you're
22 on trial track for June 7th in the event that summary
23 judgment were denied as a result of the March 16 hearing.

24 All right. Anything else we need to discuss then
25 this morning on 20-08042, other than the Court saying

Page 19

1 obviously feel free to settle between now and then and take
2 it out of my hands?

3 MR. CAMPBELL: For defendant, nothing further,
4 Your Honor.

5 MR. NOLAN: One question from the plaintiff. Your
6 Honor, how is it in New York? Are you doing trials via Zoom
7 or is everything shut down?

8 THE COURT: So as of right now, the March 16 will
9 definitely be via WebEx, and we'll issue an order setting
10 that WebEx protocol. June 7, I don't know yet whether we'll
11 be live or Memorex, I guess is the old line, but whether
12 we'll be live or via WebEx or some combination; details to
13 follow on that. But at the current time, I have been and
14 will continue to try cases via WebEx even while we're
15 operating under our emergency code of procedures.

16 MR. NOLAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: All right, very well. Thank you,
18 both.

19 MR. CAMPBELL: All right, thank you. Have a great
20 day.

21 CLERK: Case Number 20-8049.

22 MR. NOLAN: Jeff Nolan appearing on behalf of the
23 Plaintiff, Howard Ehrenberg.

24 MR. ROSEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Sanford
25 Rosen, Rosen and Associates, PC. And I'm appearing on

Page 20

1 behalf of the Defendant.

2 THE COURT: All right. Very well.

3 MR. NOLAN: Your Honor?

4 THE COURT: Mr. Nolan, on status, please go ahead.

5 MR. NOLAN: Yeah. Your Honor, so we had submitted
6 at the prior pretrial conference, Counsel and I had at least
7 uploaded a case management and discovery plan. It has not
8 been executed by the Court. In the interim, since the last
9 scheduling conference, Counsel for the Defendants and I have
10 met and conferred and we went through some of the issues in
11 the case.

12 This is a \$6-million fraudulent conveyance action.
13 And there's an issue with some of the transfers. And
14 Defendants had indicated they had received some of the
15 transfers, and they had not received others. The Trustee
16 has subsequently gone back and looked at some of the
17 underlying transfers that are at issue. And I believe, Your
18 Honor, what we are going to do is either amend the complaint
19 to add more detail for the Defendant as to some of the
20 multi-million dollar transfers or, you know, provide that
21 information with specificity.

22 And once we do that, I think the parties at least
23 are working amicably enough that we can submit a case
24 management and discovery plan to the Court that'll track
25 this in a similar fashion to some of the other adversaries.

Page 21

1 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rosen?

2 MR. ROSEN: No, that's accurate, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: All right. In terms of the dates and
4 deadlines, I know that you all had from a prior conference
5 talked about discovery ending yesterday and experts by early
6 April. Are you talking about other dates, different dates,
7 at this point?

8 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MR. NOLAN: We would submit a discovery plan that
11 would probably have, you know, a two-week lag to go ahead.
12 I mean we've done Rule 26 disclosures, but we've probably
13 then set forth a fact discovery period which would be, you
14 know, 90 to 120 days and then have the dates for experts
15 similar to all the other case management and discovery plans
16 that you've seen from our firm.

17 THE COURT: All right. So under current
18 contemplation, I'm just trying to think when would be the
19 most productive time to have you all back in. If you're
20 talking about discovery -- fact discovery cutting off late
21 April, perhaps May, and then experts to follow on, it may
22 make more sense to simply bring you in for your next
23 pretrial conference in May when we're setting up pretrial
24 conferences for Orion. I don't know that it's going to be
25 productive to have you all back in before then. Do you have

Page 22

1 a sense of that, Mr. Nolan?

2 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor. I think we'll have
3 the pleadings at issue in the next 30 days. So we could
4 either -- a couple of different scenarios. We could either
5 be back in front of the Court on March 16th, and the Court
6 could enter a case management and discovery plan based on
7 what the Court felt was appropriate where the parties were.
8 Or I think we could simply stipulate to the case management
9 and discovery plan and submit it to the Court for review and
10 approval without, you know, having to clog the courtroom and
11 see us again.

12 THE COURT: All right. The second sounds like it
13 may be more cost effective and efficient. Mr. Rosen, do you
14 have a view on that?

15 MR. ROSEN: I agree with you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: All right. So then let's do this,
17 we'll set -- let you do it by amended complaint or a
18 supplemental complaint. You all are working cooperatively
19 together. I'll leave it to you all to work that out. What
20 we'll do is we'll adjourn today's pretrial conference to May
21 18th at 2 o'clock. May 18th at 2 o'clock, anticipating that
22 well before then the Court will have entered a trial
23 scheduling order that would include the dates that the
24 parties have worked out for close of discovery and other
25 issues which you may stipulate to.

Page 23

1 Obviously, if something comes up where you need us
2 before May, you know where we are. But in terms of a
3 pretrial conference on keeping the case tracking toward a
4 trial, I think May 18th will work fine. And then once we
5 get the amended proposed scheduling order in, then we'll
6 issue that order and then we'll find you all a trial date
7 consistent with the deadlines -- the dates and deadlines
8 that you all are currently discussing.

9 But for today's purposes, Mr. Nolan, will you
10 docket notice of adjournment of the pretrial conference to
11 May 18 at 2 o'clock? And then we'll look for the submission
12 of the amended proposed scheduling order.

13 MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

14 MR. ROSEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 CLERK: Case Number 20-8052.

16 MR. NOLAN: Jeff Nolan appearing on behalf of the
17 Plaintiff, Howard Ehrenberg in his capacity as Liquidating
18 Trustee.

19 THE COURT: Do we have Defendant's counsel?

20 MR. NOLAN: I did not hear him sign on. It's
21 Anthony Giuliani.

22 THE COURT: Ms. Mills, do we have him on?

23 CLERK: Let me see if someone just came on. I
24 don't have him on, Judge.

25 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

Page 24

1 CLERK: I don't know --

2 THE COURT: Mr. Nolan?

3 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor. So, Your Honor, we
4 have a case management and discovery plan in place in this
5 adversary. Fact discovery is to be completed no later than
6 March 15th. There's been no depositions yet, but there has
7 been written discovery exchanged. And we're just moving
8 along in that capacity. There's been a number of subpoenas
9 issued. So, you know, nothing eventful to report to the
10 Court.

11 THE COURT: All right. And we do have a proposed
12 discovery control plan. I don't see that the June 7 date
13 that the Court had discussed earlier would likely work for
14 the trial on this one since expert discovery would not be
15 completed until the end of May. I don't think that gives
16 you all enough time.

17 MR. NOLAN: Yeah. In this one, Your Honor -- I'm
18 sorry, I didn't fill you in on the big picture. This is a
19 fraudulent conveyance cause of action for about \$250,000.
20 It's a little more complicated than some of the other
21 matters. So I would agree with the Court there could be
22 issues, since I've issued approximately six subpoenas to
23 different entities, that could raise an issue, a factual
24 issue trying to get everything in the door before the close
25 of fact discovery.

Page 25

1 So Plaintiff certainly is -- it's acceptable to
2 the Plaintiff to have this on a little later of a trajectory
3 than the Schoor matter.

4 THE COURT: All right. Would it make sense,
5 again, in terms of cost and efficiency, to bring this one
6 back in on May 18th? It'll be pretty close to the end of --
7 at least the contemplated end of expert discovery, we'll
8 issue you a scheduling order that includes a trial date that
9 incorporates the dates and deadlines that you all have
10 agreed to. That trial date will not be June or earlier.

11 I don't know that there's a reason to bring you
12 all back in before the May 18.

13 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor. I think that's
14 acceptable. I mean depending upon what is, you know,
15 determined through fact discovery, this might be a similar
16 case as Schoor that might have an intentional fraudulent
17 theory. And I mean we could all visit that in May 18th
18 after fact discovery is cut.

19 THE COURT: All right. Fair enough. All right.
20 So then for today's purposes, Mr. Nolan, if you'll docket
21 notice of adjournment to May 18 at 2 o'clock, let Mr.
22 Giuliani know we missed him. And in the event that there's
23 a need for a pre-hearing, a pre-motion conference if the
24 Plaintiff does tilt towards summary judgment on this one,
25 unless there's a reason or need to have that sooner, then

Page 26

1 you could also use the May 18 at 2 o'clock for that unless
2 there's a need to have it sooner.

3 MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 CLERK: Case Number 20-8051.

5 MR. NOLAN: Jeff Nolan appearing on behalf of the
6 Plaintiff, Howard Ehrenberg.

7 MS. HADDEN: And Maryann Hadden appearing on
8 behalf of Defendant 2 River Terrace Apartment 12-J, LLC.

9 MR. PITTIINSKY: Larry Pittinsky, Rosenberg &
10 Pittinsky, appearing on Riverhouse -- Board of Managers of
11 Riverhouse Condominium.

12 THE COURT: All right. The Court had notified the
13 parties we were going to use this morning as argument on
14 summary judgment. Let me ask before we launch into that,
15 has there been any change on the status on the ground with
16 respect to the sale of the unit or, in the bigger picture,
17 settlement issues?

18 MR. PITTIINSKY: Your Honor, Mr. Pittinsky speaking
19 on the sale. I don't know if you want that to go first.
20 The sale's scheduled for the 29th of this month and
21 dependent upon what Your Honor does vis-à-vis the
22 Plaintiff's motion, whether the sale will proceed or not on
23 that date. But it was adjourned. If Your Honor remembers
24 from the last court appearance, I made a representation to
25 speak to the Board and to work cooperatively with all

Page 27

1 parties. And we did adjourn the sale. The new date is
2 January 29th.

3 MS. HADDEN: And, also, Your Honor, on that, same
4 issue as to the sale. I was asked by my client --

5 THE COURT: Please state your name again, please.

6 MS. HADDEN: Oh, I apologize, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Just state your name again. That's
8 okay.

9 MS. HADDEN: Maryann Hadden. I was asked by my
10 client to file a proceeding in state court to attempt to
11 stop the sale, obviously not knowing how things will resolve
12 in front of Your Honor today in regards to the summary
13 judgment motion. So an order to show cause and a complaint
14 were both filed in state court yesterday. I do not have an
15 index number yet, which is the only reason why I have not
16 yet served them on Mr. Pittinsky.

17 But, Mr. Pittinsky, I will -- I'll actually email
18 you a copy before I get the index number just so that you
19 have the paperwork in advance.

20 MR. PITTIINSKY: I appreciate that courtesy, but --
21 and I'm not going to debate this before Judge Turner. But
22 under the rules, if you're seeking a stay, you are required
23 to serve me with those papers prior to filing under the
24 local court rules. So you have not done that.

25 MS. HADDEN: I have not even received an index

Page 28

1 number, so I will -- we'll obviously not debate this at this
2 point, but I'll speak with you on -- if it's acceptable to
3 you, I'll give you a call once we're off the record here and
4 we can have a conversation later.

5 MR. PITTIINSKY: That's fine.

6 MS. HADDEN: Okay, thank you.

7 THE COURT: Let me, and I appreciate --

8 MS. HADDEN: Thank you.

9 THE COURT: -- I appreciate you all taking that
10 dispute over there -- well, that narrow issue over there.
11 But in terms of a bigger-picture issue, obviously, if there
12 have been settlement discussions, I don't want to know who
13 asked for what and who offered what, that's not my province.
14 But have the parties discussed a protocol to monetize --
15 that's the big-dollar word they use in the Southern District
16 of New York and other courts -- monetizing the unit,
17 basically selling the unit off, paying off the -- kind of
18 the liens that are putting the time trigger on their sale
19 and then simply duking it out over who gets the rest?

20 MR. NOLAN: Jeff Nolan --

21 THE COURT: I assume, Mr. Nolan, that the
22 Trustee's long-term plan if he prevails on litigation is
23 he's going to sell the unit, convert it to cash, and figure
24 out what to do with the money. So I'm wondering if you all
25 have already had that discussion now to see if you can do

Page 29

1 that now while the litigation sorts itself out.

2 MR. NOLAN: Well, Your Honor, I can state to the
3 Court that I did have conversations with the Defendant to
4 try to step around some of the difficulties with the lien
5 that's against the unit and get it in a position that it
6 could certainly go in that direction. That is accurate,
7 Your Honor, that the Trustee's perspective is that this is
8 an asset of the estate that should be monetized.

9 The Trustee certainly can hold title under the
10 trust agreement. But the Trustee, as the Court would know,
11 is not in the business of operating condominium units,
12 residential condominium units. And -- but we just have been
13 unable to unearth this condominium unit and was hoping that
14 the summary judgment motion might present a path to do that.

15 I think the Plaintiff is certainly in agreement
16 with what the Court is stating that -- I don't know if
17 Mr. -- if the Defendant believes that the real property is
18 unique in such a way that they would share that it's a money
19 dispute as opposed to something, you know, deeper.

20 THE COURT: Ms. Hadden?

21 MS. HADDEN: There's certainly at least some
22 personal property involved in the apartment that the manager
23 of my client has not had access to. So in that sense, I
24 can, you know, certainly represent that he at least would
25 consider it to be an individual item of real property as

Page 30

1 opposed to a monetizable asset.

2 And Mr. Nolan's absolutely correct. We did, you
3 know, engage in some initial discussions about it. I can't
4 say that we're at the point or even close to the point where
5 I would describe it as being something where we're in
6 agreement on it, not to say that that agreement isn't
7 possible in the future but we're certainly not there yet.

8 THE COURT: All right.

9 MR. PITTINSKY: So, Your Honor, from the
10 Condominium's point of view, if the unit gets sold by the
11 entity that's technically on the deed, we would have our
12 rights. But I don't see the Board waiting for that event to
13 occur just in a vacuum, number one.

14 Number two, any claim by Ms. Hadden that there's
15 been access denied or not permitted, it's just factually
16 false. We would never make a claim. Actually, let me
17 revisit that. If there's personal property in the apartment
18 and our judgment is not satisfied by virtue of the sale,
19 then we might seek a restraint against anything that's in
20 the apartment if it's owned by the LLC. But that's getting
21 ahead of myself in terms of the collection on the judgment.

22 THE COURT: From what's been told to the Court
23 thus far, if this unit were sold in an arms-length open
24 transaction and it didn't bring enough to pay off the
25 condominium lien, we'd be having a much less pleasant

Page 31

1 conversation than what we're having right now, so --

2 MS. HADDEN: I think that's accurate, Your Honor.

3 MR. NOLAN: Your Honor, Jeff Nolan for the
4 Plaintiff. I think it would be a fair assumption for the
5 Court that if the Plaintiff did prevail and the conveyance
6 was set aside, that the Trustee would move to immediately,
7 in a regular sale that could maximize the value, liquidate
8 the property. And that would not necessarily mean that, you
9 know, that the money realized couldn't be somehow, you know,
10 utilized to, A, satisfy the Condominium Association and, B,
11 before the Court's jurisdiction to do as it, you know,
12 ultimately determines should be done.

13 I mean it would be an estate asset, and it would
14 be subject to the bankruptcy court's oversight and approval
15 just like any other bankruptcy court case.

16 THE COURT: All right. Well, I would encourage
17 the parties to pick -- I will generously say pick up those
18 conversations where they left off. I'm sure, as you all
19 know, that there are procedures specifically under Section
20 363(f) of the Bankruptcy Code to have the sale of interest
21 in which the estate -- property in which the estate claims
22 an interest sold free and clear of lien, claims,
23 encumbrances, have those liens attach to the proceeds, pay
24 the condominium assessment and liens off, and then fight
25 over who gets the -- what would appear at this point appear

1 to be several million dollars of proceeds.

2 That's not before me today. But, again, I would
3 encourage the parties to pick those discussions up where
4 they may have left off.

5 So let me turn then to, Mr. Nolan, if you want to
6 then proceed on the summary judgment motion.

7 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

8 Your Honor, we submitted a joint statement of
9 fact, uncontroverted facts, with the cooperation of Counsel
10 for the Defendant. And, you know, we're here on a Trustee's
11 motion for summary judgment, because in the Trustee's
12 opinion, this is a textbook case of a fraudulent conveyance.
13 The underlying facts are not in dispute. There's no dispute
14 that the transfer took place, that 5.6 million was taken out
15 of the Debtor's bank accounts by the Debtor's CEO who
16 controlled and operated a debtor entity in the healthcare
17 sector, and he took the money out not to buy something
18 related to the business of the Debtor but to buy a
19 residential condo in Manhattan.

20 There's no dispute before the Court that the title
21 to the real property was parked in an LLC which the CEO
22 incorporated only days before and which he owns, controls,
23 and says he solely manages. There's also no dispute before
24 this Court that the CEO instructed his identity be concealed
25 with respect it purchasing and occupying the condominium

Page 33

1 unit. There's no dispute that he thereafter moved into the
2 unit solely for his own personal benefit, and he's been
3 using the condominium unit solely under his own control and
4 personal benefit, allowed others to use it for their
5 personal benefit including his family members, his
6 girlfriend, et cetera.

7 I think one thing that should give this Court some
8 confidence that the CEO manipulated and controlled this
9 debtor entity however he wanted to use it is that after he
10 moved into the property, he used the Debtor's credit cards
11 to pay for the upkeep for at least a year and a quarter that
12 he occupied the unit. It's not a disputed fact in the
13 separate statement that about \$67,000 was incurred on the
14 Debtor's credit cards to pay for the taxes, the common costs
15 associated with it.

16 There was nothing put forward in the opposition to
17 justify why an executive with the Debtor could do such --
18 take such actions. That should give the Court another piece
19 of evidence to indicate that the Debtor was manipulated by
20 the CEO.

21 The motion sets forth, Your Honor, admissible
22 evidence that the diversion of funds was, in fact, simply a
23 cash-and-grab. The opposition does not dispute that the
24 transaction occurred. They simply try to justify it here in
25 2020 and the year 2021 that, hey, there's some documents

Page 34

1 that could be their contention would support the basis for a
2 debt and the diversion of \$5.6 million.

3 But the facts before the Court, Your Honor, it's
4 not disputed that there's no book entries that, A,
5 memorialize an antecedent debt and, B, there's no book
6 entries -- nothing in the Debtor's books and records that
7 evidence that the transfer of this real -- of the money and
8 the transfer of the real property satisfied an antecedent
9 debt.

10 So what the Court's left with is the estate which
11 is depleted of \$5.6 million and with no similar exchanging
12 value given to the Debtor. And that's the textbook
13 definition of a fraudulent conveyance, has the estate been
14 depleted without exchanging property of similar value to the
15 Debtor to the prejudice of the Debtor's unsecured creditors.

16 Our papers, the Mellon Bank case, which says
17 that's kind of the big picture that the Court looks at when
18 they look at a fraudulent conveyance. And if anything, Your
19 Honor, the Plaintiff's contention is the opposition should
20 give the Court some confidence that what the evidence the
21 Plaintiff said occurred is in fact true. We submitted --

22 THE COURT: That's more -- Mr. Nolan, hang on,
23 that's more on the actual intent side because I think you're
24 now -- it sounds like you were now going into the
25 constructive fraudulent transfer side. And let me ask you

Page 35

1 on the constructive fraudulent transfer side, we do have a
2 fairly extensive affidavit from Mr. Jones, but he's not
3 presented as a solvency expert.

4 He's done a forensic analysis and is providing
5 some contemporaneous and prior -- some contemporaneous, some
6 subsequent documents. But he does not -- possibly because
7 he wasn't retained to do this, he's not actually expressed
8 an opinion on solvency or insolvency on or before or after
9 the dates of the transfers of the payments for the condo.

10 MR. NOLAN: That's correct, Your Honor. We did
11 not submit a -- and we have not submitted a solvency report.
12 The motion on the constructive fraud side of the analysis is
13 basically that, number one, if the Debtor evidences to the
14 Court or the Plaintiff evidences to the Court that there was
15 no consideration for the transaction, then insolvency -- the
16 Debtor's presumed to be insolvent, as well as if the --
17 under 273(a), there's another theory that we set forth to
18 the Court which that under 273(a), the analysis is good
19 faith and fair consideration.

20 And if the Plaintiff shows to the Court it's a
21 self-interested transaction, that's a transaction where the
22 defendant is on both sides of the equation and which we have
23 shown here, it's undisputed. I mean the opposition, Your
24 Honor, essentially tries to justify the transaction by
25 saying Mr. Parmar, the CEO of the transferor, is simply

Page 36

1 paying himself what he was entitled to as the transferee.

2 Under New York Creditor Law 273-A, that's a self-
3 interested transaction and it cannot -- it can never be made
4 in good faith. That's a bad-faith transaction in that the
5 CEO is favoring himself over creditors of the estate. And
6 the transaction fails under 273-A regardless of the issue of
7 solvency, irregardless.

8 THE COURT: Well, what if Mr. Parmar were actually
9 owed \$6 million at the time of the condo purchase and paid
10 himself \$6 million directly? Is that still on its face a
11 fraudulent transfer?

12 MR. NOLAN: Yes, it is. Because the way -- first
13 off, there's nothing in the books and records to indicate --
14 I mean there's no W-2, there's no -- there's nothing in the
15 books and records that memorializes that this is a
16 compensation, that there was compensation paid to an
17 executive. I mean that would be in the Debtor's books and
18 records as a liability. It would be in the Debtor's books
19 and records as an expense that could be set off against
20 income.

21 I mean there would be any number of different
22 places in the Debtor's books and records if Mr. Parmar had
23 actually take that money as income that that would appear.
24 But there's nothing in the books and records to say that.
25 So --

Page 37

1 THE COURT: No, I understand that. But it sounded
2 as if you were arguing even if -- capital I, capital F --
3 even if Mr. Parmar was owed \$6 million, buying the condo as
4 his form of compensation is on its face a fraudulent
5 transfer, whether actual or constructive, because there's an
6 absence of good faith.

7 MR. NOLAN: Yes. It's -- Your Honor, we would say
8 that that's an accurate statement of the law that an insider
9 payment is not in good faith regardless of whether it's paid
10 on account of an antecedent debt -- and I would instruct the
11 Court in my reply papers, I cited to the American Media v.
12 Bainbridge decision. And American Media, the president was
13 -- of the debtor was a gentleman by the name of Ruderman.
14 He paid himself to repay loans which he said that were
15 valid. And, in fact, in that case, you know, he submitted
16 evidence that there was a debt that was owed to him and he
17 took the money out to pay himself back.

18 And the court in that case said that the
19 requirement of good faith is not fulfilled through
20 preferential transfers of corporate funds to debtors -- to
21 directors, officers, or shareholders of a corporation. And
22 so -- and I cited a number of other cases in New York that
23 also stand for that proposition that that type of a
24 transaction violates 273-A on its face.

25 There's some other -- there's another case, Your

Page 38

1 Honor, is the American -- let me just grab this. It was the
2 Atlantic Shipping Corp v. Chemical Bank decision, Your
3 Honor, 818 F.2d 240 (2d Cir.1987). And that case sets forth
4 that New York -- it's well settled in New York that the
5 general rule or the exception to the general rule that
6 repayment of an antecedent debt does not constitute fair
7 consideration when the recipient of the payment is a
8 corporate insider, i.e., an officer, director, or major
9 shareholder of the transferor corporation.

10 And that is admitted by the Defendant in the
11 opposition, Your Honor, at paragraph 32. In one paragraph,
12 Mr. Parmar and the Defendant admit that this is a self-
13 interested transaction solely to benefit one person who is
14 the executive officer and director and majority shareholder
15 of both the transferor and the transferee.

16 So the motion, at least, Your Honor, from our
17 perspective under constructive fraud sets forth two paths
18 that would allow the Court to find that this is a
19 constructively fraudulent transfer even without addressing
20 the issue of solvency.

21 In fact, we thought, Your Honor, in submitting the
22 motion that even though we didn't have a solvency opinion
23 that we could rely on the tax records and the Debtor's books
24 and records, Your Honor. And I cited to a couple of cases
25 at page 22 of my motion that sets forth if a debtor has a

Page 39

1 negative income for each year and is consecutively throwing
2 up negative losses like the Debtor was doing in this
3 case -- negative 12 million in 2015, negative 40 million for
4 net income in 2016, negative 20 million in 2017 -- and their
5 negative retained earnings were \$133 million by the time
6 they filed the petition in bankruptcy, that that is evidence
7 of insolvency. Negative net operating losses are evidence
8 of insolvency under the Bankruptcy Code under the In re FHI
9 decision.

10 And it at least pushed the burden over to the
11 Defendants, Your Honor, to come forth with some credible
12 admissible evidence that what the Trustee was setting forth
13 that the Debtor was just racking up losses every year was
14 not the case. And nothing was put forth for an argument
15 that was submitted by any admissible evidence, Your Honor,
16 to give the Court some type of hesitation that the Debtor
17 was actually solvent or had some ability to pay its debts.

18 In fact, the opposition admits a separate
19 statement of fact, Your Honor, that there was a judgment
20 issued against the Defendant -- or the Debtor in 2015 for
21 about \$200,000 and that debt was never paid by the Debtor.
22 It was a judgment out of the Southern District of Texas, and
23 it is outstanding as of today.

24 And there's a third path for finding a valid
25 constructive fraud against the -- under New York Debtor

Page 40

1 Creditor Law, there's a third path for this Court to find or
2 grant the summary judgment if the Court finds that either at
3 the time or before the transfer there was a docketed
4 judgment against the Debtor and it was unsatisfied, then it
5 a per-se constructively fraudulent transfer.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Nolan, jumping from that because
7 that does segue whether you intended to or not to another
8 question the Court has which is it's really -- I view it as
9 a remedies question, and I think both sides touch on it on
10 the papers, which is for whom the recovery may be set aside.

11 There seems to be an issue raised at least by the
12 Defendant that, well, even if you're right, even if the
13 Plaintiff is right on its recoveries theories, the
14 conveyance can only be set aside to satisfy the 200,000 or
15 so dollars of creditors that existed at the time of the
16 purchase. Will you address that?

17 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor. I took the
18 Plaintiff's -- the Defendant's argument to mean that the
19 Trustee -- only that the party that docketed the judgment
20 would be entitled to make a claim of constructive fraud
21 under 273-A, that you actually had to be the creditor that
22 was chasing the debtor and was unpaid.

23 And I set forth in our reply, Your Honor, a number
24 of cases that specifically held that you don't need to be
25 the -- it seems to be it would be a standing issue is that

Page 41

1 you don't need to be the creditor that actually docketed the
2 judgment to say that a transfer that occurred after your
3 judgment was docketed should be set aside.

4 And the reason I would submit to the Court that
5 our interpretation is more reasonable is, number one is the
6 opposition didn't set forth any case law to guide the Court
7 that the Court should read that statute so narrowly that
8 it's restricted to the judgment creditor. And number two
9 is, Your Honor, our reply set forth three cases, one of
10 them's in the Eastern District Bankruptcy Court New York
11 that set forth that a trustee could -- if the docketed
12 judgment exists at the time of the transfer, the trustee can
13 step into the shoes and can enforce that theory of liability
14 against the transferee and for good reason, Your Honor.

15 Those cases talk about the fact that it's the
16 purpose of 273-A is to stigmatize transfers that allow money
17 to go out of the estate when a valid judgment debtor --
18 judgment creditor exists. It's just -- it's not something
19 under New York law that ever has been encouraged, and those
20 particular cases -- one of them which I believe is the
21 Akerman case, are all instances which the Trustee steps into
22 the shoes. And that's nothing inconsistent with cases that
23 are in front of the Court.

24 Trustees just by virtue of the fact of a petition
25 being filed in bankruptcy are always forced to step into the

Page 42

1 shoes of a creditor to use state fraudulent conveyance law.

2 I mean, the predicant --

3 THE COURT: My question is not so much the 544(a)
4 imbued or hypothetical creditor status of the trustee. My
5 question is really -- and the reason I posed it is more of a
6 remedies question which is, if the allegation is the
7 transfer was fraudulent as to creditors who existed at the
8 time of the transfer, is the trustee's recovery limited to
9 the amount necessary to satisfy those creditors as opposed
10 to a transfer which is fraudulent as to existing and future
11 creditors and whether or not and to what extent there's
12 evidence in this record of who those future creditors may
13 be.

14 Again, I'll try to pose the question differently.
15 Set insolvency issues aside, if the debtor that made the
16 payments at the time the debtor made the payments owed
17 \$250,000 to other creditors and chose not to make those
18 payments, those creditors should be satisfied from the
19 recovery of the asset transferred. So who is it here for
20 whom the trustee seeks recovery if it's more than just the
21 two creditors who existed or had claims or judgments at the
22 time of the condo purchase?

23 MR. NOLAN: I am trying to identify. I identify
24 for the Court two cases that came out of New York that
25 talked about a trustee stepping in and setting aside a

Page 43

1 transfer to satisfy a judgment creditor that existed on the
2 -- had docketed a judgment. I don't believe either one of
3 those cases, Your Honor, made a distinction about limiting
4 or quantifying the amount of damages based on the judgment.
5 I think the bigger picture on those cases, Your Honor, and I
6 think it's borne out by the cases -- the case comments in
7 the case law is that the court stigmatizes the transfer
8 where legitimate creditors not only were owed money but
9 docketed a judgment and insiders went ahead and transferred
10 money around those creditors and those -- as long as the
11 trustee can prove that those creditors were never paid, that
12 the rationale is to set off the transfer.

13 I guess the Court could be in a situation at some
14 point if the Court agree with my interpretation that you
15 could have a transfer that's more deminimus -- I mean, a
16 transfer that's larger and you could have a deminimus
17 judgment and there could be, you know, an equity issue
18 about, well, geez, if it's only \$1,000 judgment and the
19 transfer is so much larger, you know, what happens to the
20 difference if you set it aside.

21 I mean, in this case, Your Honor, general
22 unsecured creditors are not anywhere in the money right now.
23 In fact, the Court knows that secured creditors are owed
24 money in this bankruptcy estate. If the transfer is set
25 aside in this particular case for 5.6 million then there's

1 not going to be -- there's no issue of the creditors
2 receiving anything significant until the secured creditors
3 are paid. But the amount of money that comes in from the
4 trustee first goes to secured creditors and then unsecured
5 creditors.

6 So I don't think we would be forcing the Court
7 into some twisted fact pattern that, you know, a simple
8 \$200,000 judgment that was recorded in 2015 is
9 disproportionate to the \$5.6 million transfer that's before
10 the Court.

11 THE COURT: Right. Well, that -- but again, if
12 I'm understanding the plaintiff's papers correctly, you all
13 are arguing that the transfer was fraudulent as to existing
14 and future creditors. Is that right?

15 MR. NOLAN: Correct, Your Honor. The way the law
16 is set is it's not only if -- it leaves the -- if the
17 transfer, you know, violates the (indiscernible) that it's
18 to an indicter. It's not made for fair consideration. But
19 if the debtor's insolvent, it's fraudulent as to not only
20 existing creditors but future creditors.

21 THE COURT: All right. I do want to -- I have
22 some questions for Ms. Hadden so I'll come back to you, Mr.
23 Nolan, for rebuttal, but I do want to give Ms. Hadden a
24 chance to argue.

25 MS. HADDEN: Certainly, Your Honor. Maryann

Page 45

1 Hadden. Your Honor, do you want to address your questions
2 first or do you want me to sort of free flow first and then
3 you can catch up to me as I got? How would you prefer?

4 THE COURT: It may be easier for me to start with
5 a question I have -- well, maybe a couple questions I have
6 and then I'll let you get to the flow of the argument that
7 you wanted to present it.

8 The first being, I don't have -- I don't seem to
9 have any summary judgment -- admissible summary judgment --
10 evidence from the defendant.

11 MS. HADDEN: Part of that, Your Honor, was my time
12 frame issues. I had some issues getting in touch with my
13 client and getting documents into the format that they
14 should have been in for the Court. Rule 56(e) obviously
15 does provide the Court with a range of possible options in
16 that scenario, obviously including the opportunity to give
17 me an opportunity to make some of those documents -- and by
18 make, I don't mean create -- but, you know, for example, the
19 bank statements that I submitted. I submitted them as
20 redacted as to the payees and payors because it was a public
21 document. Obviously, I can submit the full unredacted
22 document to the Court with copy to counsel in a non-public,
23 non-ECF forum. I believe I have a certification from Chase
24 as to those records because they were obtained as part of
25 discovery in another matter. I may not so I need an

Page 46

1 opportunity to get a discovery from Chase as to that.

2 As to the consulting agreement between FUH and
3 CHT, that being another obviously substantial exhibit from
4 the defendant's perspective, that's something where a
5 certification would presumably have to come from Mr. Parmar
6 as the manager of FUH. And obviously --

7 THE COURT: Those are the documents more to which
8 the Court's question goes because I don't see in the summary
9 judgment record an affidavit from Mr. Parmar saying that on
10 or about the dates of the transfers at issue I was owed 6
11 million, 5 million, 9 million, \$12 million by the transfer
12 or entity and the debts that were owed to me were satisfied
13 in part, in full, through the purchase of the 2 River
14 Terrace condominium unit.

15 MS. HADDEN: That's correct, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: I don't see anything along those
17 lines.

18 MS. HADDEN: I understand. Part of that was
19 essentially an excess of caution on my part in that Mr.
20 Parmar obviously was a defendant in a indicted criminal case
21 so my effort is always to avoid any scenario in which I am
22 requesting affidavit from him for anything that could be
23 connected to that criminal matter. And so I incorrectly
24 relied on the burden being on the movant in a Rule 56 motion
25 in that it is up to the movant to establish that the

Page 47

1 evidence is such that a reasonable jury could not return a
2 verdict for the opponent. But obviously I (indiscernible)
3 Parmar.

4 THE COURT: No, I'm not posing it as an error in
5 strategy of substance. I'm just -- in looking over the
6 summary judgment record that I have -- obviously, the Court
7 should only consider evidence which is in the form which
8 would be admissible at the time of trial and we do have a
9 series of objections from the trustee to the summary
10 judgment evidence that's been submitted whether due to lack
11 of affidavit or attestation from Mr. Parmar or from anyone
12 else who may have knowledge of the relevant fact.

13 And so for 56(e) purposes, if your response as
14 well under Rule 56(e), I need more time to gather the
15 documents -- if that's one -- if it's in the response, and,
16 two, if it's a question of, I need an affidavit -- the
17 defendant would like to submit an affidavit from Mr. Parmar
18 to attest to the facts that are asserted in the response,
19 however, due to other circumstances, he's unavailable to
20 submit an affidavit at this time, for some time, for
21 whatever period of time -- I'm not going to consider as
22 evidence evidence which is not in admissible form as Rule 56
23 requires.

24 MS. HADDEN: I understand that, Your Honor. And,
25 yes, it's -- so I sort of have a two-part response. As to

1 items such as the bank statements, I would be able to
2 provide certified copies for the Court. It just may require
3 a, you know, brief amount of time in order to do that.
4 However, as to an affidavit from Mr. Parmar because of the
5 extenuating circumstances os the criminal case, I'm in a
6 situation where he would be willing to provide an affidavit.
7 I would have the ability to obtain an affidavit but it puts
8 him in a very awkward position in terms of his criminal case
9 and his Fifth Amendments rights. I'm very hesitant to do
10 that.

11 THE COURT: So then -- and I don't know. We can
12 talk more specifically about the bank records if that's
13 something that the trustee is maintaining its objection to,
14 but in terms of the allegations that on or about such-and-
15 such a date, I, Mr. Parmar, was owed 4 million, 8 million,
16 12 million, whatever the number is, there's just no evidence
17 in the record to support that. And the second prong of that
18 going back to something Mr. Nolan -- the trustee -- argued
19 in papers and this morning, even if that is the case or was
20 the case, there's nothing in the record indicating -- in
21 admissible or inadmissible form -- that Mr. Parmar or anyone
22 else took on the tax burden of actually receiving \$6 million
23 or so in compensation back in December of 2015 and February
24 of 2016. So is 2 River asserting that in fact Mr. Parmar or
25 his entities received \$5.5 million of compensation in 2015

1 and 2016 through the purchase of the condominium?

2 MS. HADDEN: Yes. And I cannot answer the
3 question as to whether or not 2 River filed tax returns
4 reflecting that because I don't know the answer honestly. I
5 should have looked at that --

6 THE COURT: Well, the argument --

7 MS. HADDEN: -- but I don't have (indiscernible)

8 THE COURT: Yes. The argument in the papers is
9 not that 2 Rivers received five-and-a-half-plus million
10 dollars of compensation. The argument in the papers is is
11 that Mr. Parmar or First United Health or one of his other
12 entities received \$5.5 million of compensation through the
13 purchase of the condominium and if that's the case,
14 presumably there exists tax filing documents -- 1099, W2s,
15 whatever they may be -- which would actually exhibit that
16 the entities who are claiming that that was their
17 compensation actually then took on the tax and associated
18 burdens of claiming that compensation for state and federal
19 tax reporting purposes.

20 MS. HADDEN: Yes, Your Honor. That is correct.

21 And that, again, would be --

22 THE COURT: I don't see, for example --

23 MS. HADDEN: -- in the category of an item -- I
24 apologize.

25 THE COURT: No. But I don't see, even in

Page 50

1 inadmissible form, you know, here's the 1099 that was issued
2 from the transfer or entity or the other form of tax
3 documents showing that in fact it expensed it out or applied
4 it to the compensation owed.

5 MS. HADDEN: That's correct. And that was
6 entirely an oversight on my part. It honestly didn't even
7 occur to me until Your Honor started speaking a moment ago
8 that that would have been another way of showing the way in
9 which the compensation was received and the fact that it was
10 acknowledged by Mr. Parmar and by his constellation of
11 entities -- using the word constellation advisedly.

12 THE COURT: No pun intended. But I --

13 MS. HADDEN: Yes. No pun intended.

14 THE COURT: I may have misunderstood. I thought
15 the defendant was arguing that, not only was Mr. Parmar or
16 were he and the entities associated at the time, actually
17 owed this money but for antecedent debt purposes, the
18 transfer -- the purchase of the condominium was actually
19 made to satisfy that antecedent debt because, like a
20 Broadway musical with no music, I guess it's academically,
21 theoretically interesting to argue the existence of
22 antecedent debt, but if the antecedent debt is not actually
23 satisfied by the transfer, what's the purpose of arguing
24 antecedent debt.

25 MS. HADDEN: No. Your Honor, did understand my

Page 51

1 papers correctly. And frankly, I should have attached tax
2 returns as documents to them. It simply didn't occur to me
3 as being another document which I could have obtained in
4 order to support it. That should have occurred to me and
5 simply didn't. But the -- your understanding of my argument
6 was entirely accurate.

7 THE COURT: That is both existed and satisfied --
8 that that's the argument.

9 MS. HADDEN: Correct, yes

10 THE COURT: All right. And so if I were to
11 conclude from the record before me that I in fact have no
12 admissible evidence of either the existence of an antecedent
13 debt at the time of December 2015 or February of 2016 and I
14 have no evidence -- no admissible evidence -- of the
15 satisfaction of such a debt, how does the defendant fend off
16 summary judgment?

17 MS. HADDEN: So summary judgment is sought by the
18 trustee under several different arguments. Obviously,
19 there's the claim -- I believe Mr. Nolan phrased it as a
20 textbook case of fraudulent conveyance -- that there was a
21 fraudulent intent involved in this transfer. And I do not
22 believe that the evidence before this Court, looking solely
23 at the admissible evidence, is such that a clear case of
24 fraudulent intent is made out.

25 I want to go back for just a moment to the

1 question that Your Honor had asked about 273(a) and I
2 believe, if I caught the question correctly, it was whether,
3 you know --- the plaintiff's argument was that a CEO could
4 never pay himself or obtain compensation for himself under
5 273(a) without it being a per se fraudulent transfer. And
6 again, if I understood that correctly, Mr. Nolan was
7 agreeing that was, you know, the logical extension of the
8 plaintiff's argument. Taking that down -- further down the
9 logical extension path, I don't believe that that complies
10 with the statute.

11 273(a) is very specific in that it applies -- and
12 this may very well be one of the reasons why the statute was
13 repealed by the legislature -- but it applies in a very
14 specific scenario where a conveyance has been made while
15 there is a pending judgment or action and it is fraudulent
16 just as to the plaintiff in that action -- that's the plain
17 language of the statute -- fraudulent as to plaintiff in
18 that action -- without regard to the actual intent of the
19 defendant, if, after final judgment, the defendant fails to
20 satisfy the judgment. So it's a very specific factual
21 scenario where there's a pending judgment or pending action
22 solely as to that particular plaintiff and in that
23 particular scenario, the regard of the -- there's no regard
24 given to the actual intent of the defendant.

25 However, extending the concept of 273(a) to say

1 that a CEO or other insider or corporate officer can never
2 by paid for a debt without it being a fraudulent transfer
3 extends that statute to the point where it become
4 unreasonable. Obviously, CEOs can be paid. Corporate
5 officers can be paid. The real question is whether or not
6 the business or the company is made insolvent by that
7 transfer or unable to pay the debt in, you know, looking
8 specifically at 273(a), that's outstanding in the action or
9 the judgment.

10 In this particular case, we're talking about a
11 debt that -- or a judgment that was approximately \$200,000,
12 looking at the two -- the combination of the two judgments
13 put together, and a \$5 million conveyance. The \$5 million
14 conveyance, if you look at the bank records of the debtor,
15 did not render the debtor insolvent at that time, did not --
16 it's essentially as if -- sort of analogizing it to more
17 normal person scenarios -- if you owe a \$20 co-pay to your
18 doctor and you haven't paid for that \$20 co-pay -- it's
19 still outstanding -- and then you go out and buy a house.
20 The fact that you've bought a house is not what is rendering
21 you unable to pay your \$20 co-pay to your doctor. You just
22 haven't in your head put those two categories in the same --
23 haven't put those two facts in the same category. You're
24 still able to pay the doctor, you just haven't gotten around
25 to doing it. It's the --

1 THE COURT: Well, but I think that that --

2 MS. HADDEN: -- defendant's argument that that's -

3 -

4 THE COURT: Right. But I think in that good
5 hypothetical, if I go out and buy a house, I'm putting the
6 house in my name so I've traded one asset for another asset.
7 The (indiscernible) here I think from the trustee's
8 standpoint is that CHT took \$5.5 million and put an asset in
9 the name of another entity.

10 MS. HADDEN: It did.

11 THE COURT: So my doctor or my, you know, medical
12 provider can't look to me for that \$20 anymore because if I
13 bought that house it's not in my name.

14 MS. HADDEN: That's a fair point. The defendant's
15 argument is that essentially because Parmar was the manager
16 of 2 Rivers Terrace and the sole human representative of 2
17 River Terrace that they're essentially equivalent. And he
18 was in a similar scenario with First United Health which was
19 the entity that had the consulting agreement with CHT.

20 Unfortunately --

21 THE COURT: Be careful how far that argument --
22 that argument may go further than you want to --

23 MS. HADDEN: Exactly.

24 THE COURT: -- but, okay. Yeah.

25 MS. HADDEN: It may very well take me for me

1 further than I need to go.

2 THE COURT: Yeah.

3 MS. HADDEN: I did also want to touch briefly on -
4 - and I'm, you know, sort of derailing myself for a moment
5 here -- but on the question of the tax returns as evidence
6 of solvency or insolvency. And I believe the trustee has
7 fairly heavily relied on them as evidence of the debtor's
8 insolvency in this form that they were filed by FTI once FTI
9 came in as a consultant in eventually dealing with the
10 debtor's estate.

11 My contention as to tax returns which I may or may
12 not have managed to argue clearly enough in the motion is
13 that a tax return, again, is something that is a somewhat
14 malleable creature while still being fully admissible under
15 the income regulations and under the tax code. Again,
16 taking sort of a real-world example, if you purchase a
17 laptop for your business, you could deduct that entire
18 expense in one tax year which reduces the income of the
19 business by a larger amount or you could amortize that
20 expense over, I think, either two or three years -- and
21 again, I'm not an accountant so don't do your taxes by what
22 I'm saying -- but if you split that item up over a two- to
23 three-year period, again, complying with the tax laws while
24 doing so, if raises the income for each of those years.

25 So you can have the same exact set of financial

1 facts leading to two very different tax returns depending on
2 how you handle amortizable expenses. And the fact that the
3 debtors filed amended tax returns showing a loss as opposed
4 to the tax returns that were originally filed that not only
5 did not show a loss but wound up with the debtor owing taxes
6 and paying those taxes, gives two very different pictures of
7 solvency and I think that goes back to the Court's question
8 as to the fact that there was no actual opinion on solvency
9 presented.

10 So I think that the central issue before the Court
11 really is solvency and the question of solvency -- whether
12 or not in a summary judgment scenario specifically we're in
13 a situation where the evidence is such that a reasonable
14 jury could not return a verdict for the defendant. And I
15 don't think we are in that scenario. I think we're in a
16 scenario where there are significant questions as to
17 solvency in particular. There are questions as to whether
18 or not there was or was not fair consideration. There's
19 questions as to whether there was or was not an antecedent
20 debt. There are questions as whether there was or was not
21 fraudulent intent.

22 Obviously, my answers to those questions are very
23 different from the plaintiff's answers to those questions.
24 But I think that we are in as scenario where really in order
25 to have an actual factual determination, you would need a

Page 57

1 solvency opinion. You would need expert opinions. You
2 would need full discovery. You'd need someone with records
3 access on both sides so that both sides could argue that
4 issue for the Court. I don't think we're in that scenario.
5 And although we are in agreement on some of the most basic
6 facts, I don't think that the agreement on those most basic
7 facts is sufficient to bring the Court to the level where
8 you would be able to make a determination on a summary
9 judgment motion.

10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Hadden.
11 Mr. Nolan, anything you want to add?

12 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor, just briefly.
13 Typically, when a fraudulent conveyance case comes before a
14 court, most of the time I'm arguing with my colleague over
15 whether or not what was given as consideration was
16 reasonably equivalent value. You know, there's opinions
17 going back and forth whether or not what was exchanged for
18 what was in the ballpark of the conveyance. Those can get
19 really fact intensive but that's not the fact pattern that's
20 in front of this Court.

21 I mean, the undisputed facts are that there's a
22 transfer in front of the Court for no consideration. None.
23 And we've submitted to the Court the case law in New York
24 that says transactions that are performed without any signs
25 of tangible consideration are presumptively fraudulent. I

Page 58

1 cited to the Mendelsohn versus Jacobowitz decision, 394 B.R.
2 646. And it talks about interfamily transfers without any
3 signs of tangible consideration as being presumably
4 fraudulent, and that's what's in front of the Court right
5 now.

6 I didn't force Mr. Parmar or the defendant to make
7 the argument in the opposition that they made, that this was
8 a self-interested transaction that benefited Mr. Parmar. I
9 just simply, in the reply brief, drew attention to the fact
10 that even if you accept Mr. Parmar or defendant's argument,
11 Your Honor, that somehow there was fair consideration
12 because there was an antecedent debt and what was
13 transferred satisfied that antecedent debt, that that
14 argument doesn't even make sense because what they've
15 submitted to the Court is, a) not admissible evidence, but
16 one of the documents says that FUH which is a separate
17 third-party corporation agreed to take stock, not to take
18 cash. They would have at best an equity interest and they'd
19 be line behind everybody else.

20 And then the argument that there's an antecedent
21 debt in the opposition, Your Honor -- it's based on a
22 formula, a formula that the defendant doesn't even give all
23 the different variables to the Court to allow the Court to
24 decide if there is -- even is an antecedent debt owed on the
25 issue of fair consideration.

1 I certainly appreciate some the arguments from the
2 bench just now about, well, what happens if Mr. Parmar
3 submitted an affidavit saying, you know, he was owed 6
4 million or 9 million and took the property in consideration
5 for that transfer. But I would submit to the Court that
6 we've submitted to the Court that the Ackerman versus
7 Ventimiglia case out of the Eastern District of New York.
8 It's at 362 B.R. 71. And in the Ackerman case, Your Honor,
9 the Court says that there has to be credible admissible
10 evidence to determine that there was, a) an amount owed
11 under a loan, and b) it has to be credible evidence as to
12 the amount of that debt and that submission of an affidavit
13 or oral testimony alone can't replace a finding of a
14 legitimate antecedent debt owed.

15 And I would think that that could give some
16 guidance to the Court or at least some comfort that if the
17 Court is so inclined to find that there hasn't been
18 admissible evidence of an antecedent debt and that there
19 hasn't been admissible evidence that an antecedent debt was
20 satisfied, that it's proper at this stage. And Your Honor,
21 we are in an -- unfortunately -- a difficult position with
22 this condominium given the confluence of factors here that
23 there is the sheriff's sale coming up and -- the opposition
24 didn't dispute that summary judgment motions, I guess, they
25 should be granted sparingly but they are proper where the

Page 60

1 facts and circumstances are ripe.

2 It saves everybody time and money. We've got a
3 property right now where the initial judgment was 200,000.

4 Now it's \$450,000 on behalf of the homeowner's association.

5 The trustee submits that there is clear evidence in front of
6 this Court that -- of both the intentional fraudulent
7 conveyance and the constructive fraudulent conveyance. And
8 there's just not a reason to kick the can down the road any
9 further. Thank you, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. I
11 -- Court appreciates the arguments from both sides and the
12 status update from counsel for the condominium association.
13 I am not prepared to rule today. I want to give further
14 consideration to both the papers and what's been argued this
15 afternoon. Having also a fairly full docket next week, I
16 cannot get to a ruling before your current sale date. I
17 would recommend that the parties continue their discussions
18 about either a further adjournment of that sale date or the
19 protocol under where the property can be monetized while the
20 Court is considering the adversary proceeding in general and
21 the summary judgment motion in particular. I will give you
22 all for your timing purposes -- Ms. Mills, can we use
23 February 9th at three o'clock at least as a tentative
24 ruling?

25 CLERK: Hold one second, Judge.

Page 61

1 THE COURT: Any time.

2 CLERK: Hold on one second. We can use two -- can
3 we go to 2:30 because you already have pre-trials on that
4 day.

5 THE COURT: All right. So February 9th at 2:30.

6 Ms. Mills, if you'll docket notice of an adjournment. This
7 is -- the intention of the Court would be to give you all a
8 ruling on this motion on February 9th at 2:30. If for some
9 reason the Court's not in a position to rule at that time,
10 we'll notify you all in advance. But that would a ruling
11 conference only. That's not any further argument. February
12 9th at 2:30.

13 MS. HADDEN: Thank you.

14 MR. NOLAN: (indiscernible)

15 THE COURT: All right. Very well --

16 MR. PITTIINSKY: Your Honor, speaking for the
17 condominium, I will consult with the board, advise them of
18 that control ruling date and then I will advise Mr. Nolan
19 and Ms. Hadden by email on what the outcome of that is. It
20 may take me a day or two to -- both of them to get the board
21 together to get an answer on that. And Ms. Hadden, I look
22 forward to speaking offline on the state court case that you
23 say you've commenced. All right?

24 MS. HADDEN: Yeah. So I'll give you a call as
25 soon we get off here.

Page 62

1 THE COURT: All right. And again, this is
2 redundant to what I've already said, but if the parties are
3 amenable to a sale protocol, the Court would certainly be
4 open to establishing the procedure under which the unit is
5 monetized and the parties fight over who gets the money.

6 All right. So then we'll be -- Ms. Mills, do we
7 have any other on the docket for this morning on the ten
8 o'clock call?

9 CLERK: That's it, Judge.

10 THE COURT: All right. So then until February 9th
11 at 2:30 p.m. Again, the Court appreciates the papers
12 submitted as well as the arguments of the parties this
13 morning.

14 MS. HADDEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 MR. NOLAN: (indiscernible), Your Honor.

16 MR. PITTIINSKY: Thank you.

17 THE COURT: The Court will therefore be in recess
18 until one o'clock and we'll go off the record. Good day,
19 all.

20 AUTOMATED VOICE: We're sorry. Your conference is
21 ending now. Please hang up.

22 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at
23 11:35 AM)

24

25

Page 63

1 C E R T I F I C A T I O N

2

3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing
4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

5

6 *Sonya M. Ledanski Hyde*

7

8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 Veritext Legal Solutions

21 330 Old Country Road

22 Suite 300

23 Mineola, NY 11501

24

25 Date: March 1, 2021

[& - actual]

Page 1

&	20-08038 1:18	3	8500 5:13
& 5:3,18 6:1,8 7:8 7:21,25 8:5,22 26:9	20-08042 1:9 18:25	30 22:3	9
0	20-08049 2:1	300 63:22	9 46:11 59:4
07748 5:21	20-08051 2:9	32 38:11	90 21:14
1	20-08052 2:17	330 63:21	906 6:3
1 63:25 1,000 43:18 10007 5:14 10016 6:4 10017 5:6 10017-2803 6:11 1099 49:14 50:1 10:01 3:6 11501 63:23 11722 3:3 11:35 62:23 12 26:8 39:3 46:11 48:16 120 21:14 125 5:20 133 39:5 15th 24:6 16 18:5,23 19:8 160,000 9:4 16th 16:20,22,23 17:3 18:3,8 22:5 18 23:11 25:12,21 26:1 18-71748 1:3 18th 22:21,21 23:4 25:6,17 190 5:20	20-8042 8:15	34th 5:5	917-809-0346 8:3
2	20-8049 19:21	362 59:8	9th 17:8,11,15 18:3 60:23 61:5,8 61:12 62:10
2	20-8051 26:4	363 31:20	a
2	20-8052 23:15	394 58:1	4 48:15
2	200,000 39:21		40 39:3
2	40:14 44:8 53:11 60:3		42 4:1
2	2015 39:3,20 44:8		450,000 60:4
2	48:23,25 51:13		5
2	2016 39:4 48:24		5 46:11 53:13,13
2	49:1 51:13		5.5 48:25 49:12
2	2017 39:4		54:8
2	2020 33:25		5.6 32:14 34:2,11 43:25 44:9
2	2021 3:5 33:25		544 42:3
2	63:25		548 10:8
2	21 3:5		56 45:14 46:24 47:13,14,22
2	22 38:25		6
2	232 6:3		6 20:12 36:9,10 37:3 46:10 48:22 59:3
2	240 38:3		646 58:2
2	250,000 24:19		67,000 33:13
2	42:17		7
2	26 21:12		7 16:10 17:17 19:10 24:12
2	273 10:5 35:17,18		71 59:8
2	36:2,6 37:24		747 6:10
2	40:21 41:16 52:1		780 5:5
2	52:5,11,25 53:8		7th 18:22
2	276 10:1 14:10,12		8
2	14:24 15:3,8		8 48:15
2	16:11,16		818 38:3
2	290 3:2		
2	29th 26:20 27:2		
2	2:30 61:3,5,8,12		
2	62:11		
2	2d 38:3		

[add - attest]

Page 2

add 20:19 57:11	agreeing 52:7	37:10 38:6 50:17	57:14
additional 9:21 11:5,9 15:14 18:10	agreement 10:10 12:10 13:22,23 29:10,15 30:6,6 46:2 54:19 57:5,6	50:19,22,22,24 51:12 56:19 58:12 58:13,20,24 59:14 59:18,19	argument 14:11 18:3 26:13 39:14 40:18 45:6 49:6,8 49:10 51:5,8 52:3
address 9:20 40:16 45:1	ahead 17:8,9,24 17:24 20:4 21:11 30:21 43:9	anthony 23:21	52:8 54:2,15,21
addressing 38:19	akerman 41:21	anticipating	54:22 58:7,10,14
adjourn 18:4 22:20 27:1	al 2:6,14,22	22:21	58:20 61:11
adjourned 26:23	alan 3:22 7:3	anymore 54:12	arguments 51:18
adjournment 23:10 25:21 60:18 61:6	allegation 42:6	anyway 12:13	59:1 60:11 62:12
admissible 33:21 39:12,15 45:9 47:8,22 48:21 51:12,14,23 55:14 58:15 59:9,18,19	allow 9:12,19 10:20,21 38:18 41:16 58:23	apartment 26:8 29:22 30:17,20	arms 30:23
admit 38:12	allowed 33:4	apologize 27:6	arvind 6:9 8:1,5
admits 39:18	amenable 62:3	appear 31:25,25 36:23	aside 16:17 31:6 40:10,14 41:3
admitted 38:10	amend 20:18	appearance 7:6 26:24	42:15,25 43:20,25
admonition 17:4	amended 22:17 23:5,12 56:3	appearances 8:17	asked 12:20,25 14:21 17:7 27:4,9
adv 1:9,18 2:1,9 2:17	amendments 48:9	appearing 8:19 19:22,25 23:16 26:5,7,10	28:13 52:1
advance 17:11 27:19 61:10	america 11:4,5,8 15:6 18:11	appears 12:7	asking 11:7 14:15
adversaries 7:16 20:25	america's 15:16	apple 10:21	assent 18:12
adversary 8:14 9:4 15:21,24 24:5 60:20	american 37:11 37:12 38:1	applied 50:3	asserted 47:18
advise 61:17,18	amicably 20:23	applies 52:11,13	asserting 48:24
advisedly 50:11	amortizable 56:2	appreciate 27:20	assessment 31:24
affidavit 35:2 46:9,22 47:11,16 47:17,20 48:4,6,7 59:3,12	amortize 55:19 59:10,12	asset 29:8 30:1 31:13 42:19 54:6 54:6,8	asset 29:8 30:1
afternoon 60:15	analogizing 53:16	associated 33:15 49:17 50:16	31:13 42:19 54:6
ago 9:14 50:7	analysis 35:4,12 35:18	associates 6:8 8:1 8:5 19:25	54:6,8
agree 17:5 22:15 24:21 43:14	analyze 11:23	association 31:10 60:4,12	assume 28:21
agreed 25:10 58:17	answer 10:17 15:18 49:2,4 61:21	approval 22:10 31:14	assumption 31:4
	answers 56:22,23	appropriate 22:7	ast 1:9,18 2:1,9,17
	antecedent 13:11 13:11 34:5,8	approximate 9:14 24:22 53:11	atlantic 38:2
		aprill 21:6,21	attach 31:23
		area 12:15	attached 51:1
		argue 44:24 50:21 55:12 57:3	attempt 27:10
		argued 17:2 48:18 60:14	attempted 12:8
		arguing 37:2 44:13 50:15,23	attention 58:9
			attest 47:18

[attestation - claim]

Page 3

attestation 47:11	60:4	buy 32:17,18 53:19 54:5	catch 45:3
attorney 7:6	believe 8:13 15:12 16:19 20:17 41:20 43:2 45:23 51:19 51:22 52:2,9 55:6	buying 37:3	categories 53:22
attorneys 5:4,12 5:19 6:2,9	believes 17:13 29:17	c	category 49:23 53:23
automated 62:20	bench 59:2	c 5:1 7:1,12 63:1,1	caught 52:2
avenue 5:5 6:3,10	benefit 33:2,4,5 38:13	calendar 18:6	cause 15:3 24:19 27:13
avoid 46:21	benefited 58:8	call 11:4 28:3 61:24 62:8	caution 46:19
awkward 48:8	best 58:18	campbell 5:23 7:10,11,11 8:16 8:21,22 10:25 11:1,2,21 15:4,11 17:22 18:13,14 19:3,19	center 5:13
b		capacity 1:11 8:20 23:17 24:8	central 3:3 56:10
b 3:21 31:10 34:5 59:11	big 16:12 24:18 28:15 34:17	capital 17:19,19 37:2,2	ceo 32:15,21,24 33:8,20 35:25 36:5 52:3 53:1
b.r. 58:1 59:8	bigger 26:16 28:11 43:5	cards 33:10,14	ceos 53:4
back 12:2,22 13:4 13:5,20,22 14:6,7 14:21 20:16 21:19 21:25 22:5 25:6 25:12 37:17 44:22 48:18,23 51:25 56:7 57:17	bite 10:21	careful 54:21	certainly 25:1 29:6,9,15,21,24 30:7 44:25 59:1 62:3
bad 36:4	board 6:2 7:22 26:10,25 30:12 61:17,20	case 1:3,9,18 2:1,9 2:17 8:14 9:5,7 12:5,12 13:9	certification 45:23 46:5
bainbridge 37:12	book 34:4,5	17:19 19:21 20:7	certified 48:2 63:3
ballpark 57:18	books 14:3 34:6 36:13,15,17,18,22 36:24 38:23	20:11,23 21:15 22:6,8 23:3,15	cetera 33:6
bank 11:4,5,8 15:5,16 18:11 32:15 34:16 38:2 45:19 48:1,12 53:14	borne 43:6	24:4 25:16 26:4 31:15 32:12 34:16 37:15,18,25 38:3	cfo 13:21
bankruptcy 1:1 3:1,23 9:5 10:8 13:16 31:14,15,20 39:6,8 41:10,25 43:24	bought 53:20 54:13	39:3,14 41:6,21 43:6,7,21,25	chance 44:24
based 13:2 15:16 22:6 43:4 58:21	box 5:20	46:20 48:5,8,19 48:20 49:13 51:20	change 26:15
basic 57:5,6	brief 17:12 48:3 58:9	51:23 53:10 57:13 57:23 59:7,8	chase 45:23 46:1
basically 28:17 35:13	briefly 55:3 57:12	61:22	chasing 40:22
basis 15:21 34:1	bring 21:22 25:5 25:11 30:24 57:7	cases 19:14 37:22 38:24 40:24 41:9	chemical 38:2
baton 9:24	broaden 14:18	41:15,20,22 42:24 43:3,5,6	chief 7:3
beast 14:20	broadway 50:20	cash 28:23 33:23 58:18	chivukula 13:21 14:4
behalf 7:11,20,22 8:1,19,23 19:22 20:1 23:16 26:5,8	bu 16:17		chose 42:17
	burden 39:10 46:24 48:22		cht 46:3 54:8,19
	burdens 49:18		ciesla 5:18 8:22
	business 12:23 13:8 29:11 32:18 53:6 55:17,19		cir.1987 38:3
			circling 14:7
			circumstances 47:19 48:5 60:1
			cited 37:11,22 38:24 58:1
			city 8:10
			claim 10:3 14:10 14:16 15:8,10

30:14,16 40:20 51:19 claiming 49:16,18 claims 14:19 31:21,22 42:21 clarification 15:1 clear 31:22 51:23 60:5 clearly 7:4 55:12 clerk 7:2,10,13,17 7:24 8:2,6,9,11,13 16:19,21,23 19:21 23:15,23 24:1 26:4 60:25 61:2 62:9 client 27:4,10 29:23 45:13 clog 22:10 close 10:19 22:24 24:24 25:6 30:4 closed 9:8 code 9:5 10:8 13:16 19:15 31:20 39:8 55:15 coded 14:3 colleague 9:21 57:14 collection 30:21 combination 19:12 53:12 come 14:5 17:1 39:11 44:22 46:5 comes 23:1 44:3 57:13 comfort 59:16 coming 11:19 59:23 commenced 61:23 comments 43:6 common 33:14 companies 14:1 company 53:6	compelling 13:13 compensation 36:16,16 37:4 48:23,25 49:10,12 49:17,18 50:4,9 52:4 competing 12:2 complaint 10:23 20:18 22:17,18 27:13 completed 24:5 24:15 complicated 24:20 complies 52:9 complying 55:23 concealed 32:24 concept 52:25 conclude 51:11 concluded 62:22 condo 6:2 32:19 35:9 36:9 37:3 42:22 condominium 7:23 26:11 29:11 29:12,13 30:25 31:10,24 32:25 33:3 46:14 49:1 49:13 50:18 59:22 60:12 61:17 condominium's 30:10 confer 9:15 17:24 conference 9:25 18:5 20:6,9 21:4 21:23 22:20 23:3 23:10 25:23 61:11 62:20 conferences 21:24 conferred 20:10 confidence 33:8 34:20	confluence 59:22 connected 46:23 connection 11:13 consecutively 39:1 consent 11:7,16 consider 16:6 29:25 47:7,21 consideration 35:15,19 38:7 44:18 56:18 57:15 57:22,25 58:3,11 58:25 59:4 60:14 considering 60:20 consistent 23:7 constellation 50:10,11 constitute 38:6 constructive 14:19 34:25 35:1 35:12 37:5 38:17 39:25 40:20 60:7 constructively 10:7 38:19 40:5 consult 61:17 consultant 13:24 55:9 consulting 13:22 13:22,25 46:2 54:19 consuming 12:5 contemplated 25:7 contemplation 10:1 21:18 contemporaneous 35:5,5 contention 34:1 34:19 55:11 continually 12:24 continue 19:14 60:17	control 24:12 33:3 61:18 controlled 32:16 33:8 controls 32:22 conversation 28:4 31:1 conversations 29:3 31:18 convert 28:23 conveyance 9:5 13:14 14:2 20:12 24:19 31:5 32:12 34:13,18 40:14 42:1 51:20 52:14 53:13,14 57:13,18 60:7,7 cooperation 32:9 cooperatively 16:25 22:18 26:25 copies 48:2 copy 27:18 45:22 corp 38:2 corporate 37:20 38:8 53:1,4 corporation 37:21 38:9 58:17 correct 11:3 15:1 30:2 35:10 44:15 46:15 49:20 50:5 51:9 correctly 44:12 51:1 52:2,6 cost 22:13 25:5 costs 33:14 counsel 8:5 9:15 9:22 20:6,9 23:19 32:9 45:22 60:12 country 63:21 couple 22:4 38:24 45:5 course 15:12
---	---	---	--

[court - designations]

Page 5

court 1:1 3:1 8:17 8:24 9:3,12,13,14 9:18,23 10:9,16 10:24 11:18 12:1 12:8 13:15 14:7 14:15 15:2,4,20 15:23 16:17,20,22 16:24 17:23 18:15 18:19,25 19:8,17 20:2,4,8,24 21:1,3 21:9,17 22:5,5,7,9 22:12,16,22 23:19 23:22,25 24:2,10 24:11,13,21 25:4 25:19 26:12,12,24 27:5,7,10,14,24 28:7,9,21 29:3,10 29:16,20 30:8,22 30:22 31:5,15,16 32:20,24 33:7,18 34:3,17,20,22 35:14,14,18,20 36:8 37:1,11,18 38:18 39:16 40:1 40:2,6,8 41:4,6,7 41:10,23 42:3,24 43:7,13,14,23 44:6,10,11,21 45:4,14,15,22 46:7,16 47:4,6 48:2,11 49:6,8,22 49:25 50:12,14 51:7,10,22 54:1,4 54:11,21,24 55:2 56:10 57:4,7,10 57:14,20,22,23 58:4,15,23,23 59:5,6,9,16,17 60:6,10,11,20 61:1,5,7,15,22 62:1,3,10,11,17 62:17	court's 17:7 31:11 31:14 34:10 46:8 56:7 61:9 courtesy 27:20 courtroom 7:3 22:10 courts 28:16 create 45:18 created 13:22 creature 55:14 credible 39:11 59:9,11 credit 33:10,14 creditor 9:6 10:5 13:16 15:3 36:2 40:1,21 41:1,8,18 42:1,4 43:1 creditors 34:15 36:5 40:15 42:7,9 42:11,12,17,18,21 43:8,10,11,22,23 44:1,2,4,5,14,20 44:20 criminal 46:20,23 48:5,8 critical 17:13 current 19:13 21:17 60:16 currently 23:8 cut 25:18 cutting 21:20	d d 7:1 damages 43:4 date 10:19 12:11 15:23 16:18 18:2 23:6 24:12 25:8 25:10 26:23 27:1 48:15 60:16,18 61:18 63:25 dates 10:14 12:3 17:5,25 18:21 21:3,6,6,14 22:23	decision 37:12 38:2 39:9 58:1 deduct 55:17 deed 30:11 deeper 29:19 defendant 1:24 2:7,15,23 8:23 9:20,22 12:22 13:5 16:5 17:10 18:1 19:3 20:1,19 26:8 29:3,17 debate 27:21 28:1 debt 9:6 13:11,11 13:15,20 15:3 34:2,5,9 37:10,16 38:6 39:21 50:17 50:19,22,22,24 51:13,15 53:2,7 53:11 56:20 58:12 58:13,21,24 59:12 59:14,18,19 debtor 1:7 10:5 11:14 13:12,20,25 32:16,18 33:9,17 33:19 34:12,15 35:13 37:13 38:25 39:2,13,16,20,21 39:25 40:4,22 41:17 42:15,16 53:14,15 56:5 debtor's 32:15,15 33:10,14 34:6,15 35:16 36:17,18,22 38:23 44:19 55:7 55:10 debtors 7:5 13:5 13:21 14:3 37:20 56:3 debts 39:17 46:12 december 48:23 51:13 decide 58:24
--	--	---	--

[detail - exception]

Page 6

detail 20:19	32:23 33:1,23	earlier 24:13	entries 34:4,6
details 19:12	59:24	25:10	equation 35:22
determination	disputed 33:12	early 15:24 21:5	equity 43:17
56:25 57:8	34:4	earnings 39:5	58:18
determine 59:10	distinction 43:3	easier 45:4	equivalent 14:18
determined 25:15	district 1:2 28:15	eastern 1:2 41:10	14:19 54:17 57:16
determines 31:12	39:22 41:10 59:7	59:7	error 47:4
difference 43:20	diversion 33:22	ecf 45:23	essentially 35:24
different 14:20	34:2	ecro 3:25	46:19 53:16 54:15
21:6 22:4 24:23	docket 23:10	effective 22:13	54:17
36:21 51:18 56:1	25:20 60:15 61:6	efficiency 25:5	establish 46:25
56:6,23 58:23	62:7	efficient 22:13	establishing 62:4
differently 42:14	docketed 40:3,19	effort 46:21	estate 29:8 31:13
difficult 59:21	41:1,3,11 43:2,9	ehrenberg 1:11	31:21,21 34:10,13
difficulties 29:4	doctor 53:18,21	1:20 2:3,11,19 4:2	36:5 41:17 43:24
directed 9:14	53:24 54:11	5:4 7:9,15 8:15,19	55:10
11:11	document 45:21	19:23 23:17 26:6	et 2:6,14,22 33:6
direction 29:6	45:22 51:3	either 16:7 20:18	evaluate 11:23
directly 36:10	documentation	22:4,4 40:2 43:2	event 17:19 18:22
director 38:8,14	13:10	51:12 55:20 60:18	25:22 30:12
directors 37:21	documents 11:6,9	email 9:19 14:4	eventful 24:9
disclosures 21:12	11:10 12:20 13:3	27:17 61:19	eventually 55:9
discovery 9:7,8	15:5,6,13 18:10	emergency 19:15	everybody 58:19
11:8 12:20 15:9	33:25 35:6 45:13	encourage 31:16	60:2
20:7,24 21:5,10	45:17 46:7 47:15	32:3	evicore 1:23
21:13,15,20,20	49:14 50:3 51:2	encouraged 41:19	evidence 13:18
22:6,9,24 24:4,5,7	58:16	encumbrances	14:1 16:7 33:19
24:12,14,25 25:7	doing 19:6 39:2	31:23	33:22 34:7,20
25:15,18 45:25	53:25 55:24	enforce 41:13	37:16 39:6,7,12
46:1 57:2	dollar 20:20 28:15	engage 30:3	39:15 42:12 45:10
discuss 16:14	dollars 32:1 40:15	enter 22:6	47:1,7,10,22,22
18:24	49:10	entered 22:22	48:16 51:12,14,14
discussed 24:13	don 8:21	entire 55:17	51:22,23 55:5,7
28:14	donald 5:23 7:10	entirely 50:6 51:6	56:13 58:15 59:10
discussing 23:8	7:11 11:2	entities 11:14	59:11,18,19 60:5
discussion 18:17	door 24:24	24:23 48:25 49:12	evidences 35:13
28:25	drew 58:9	49:16 50:11,16	35:14
discussions 28:12	due 47:10,19	entitled 36:1	exact 55:25
30:3 32:3 60:17	duking 28:19	40:20	exactly 54:23
disproportionate		entity 12:11 30:11	example 45:18
44:9	e	32:16 33:9 46:12	49:22 55:16
dispute 28:10	e 3:21,21 5:1,1 7:1	50:2 54:9,19	exception 38:5
29:19 32:13,13,20	7:1 45:14 47:13		
	47:14 63:1		

[excess - further]

Page 7

excess 46:19	f.2d 38:3	feel 19:1	format 45:13
exchanged 10:21 24:7 57:17	face 36:10 37:4,24	fees 14:4	formula 58:22,22
exchanging 34:11 34:14	fact 9:8 13:2,3 21:13,20 24:5,25 25:15,18 32:9	felt 22:7	forth 21:13 33:21 35:17 38:3,17,25
executed 20:8	33:12,22 34:21	fend 51:15	39:11,12,14 40:23
executive 33:17 36:17 38:14	37:15 38:21 39:18 39:19 41:15,24	fhi 39:8	41:6,9,11 57:17
exhibit 46:3 49:15	43:23 44:7 47:12	fifth 48:9	forum 45:23
existed 40:15 42:7 42:21 43:1 51:7	48:24 50:3,9 51:11 53:20 56:2	fight 31:24 62:5	forward 9:10 10:2 14:9 33:16 61:22
existence 50:21 51:12	56:8 57:19,19 58:9	figure 28:23	frame 45:12
existing 42:10 44:13,20	factors 59:22	file 9:12 14:22	frankly 51:1
exists 41:12,18 49:14	facts 9:16,17 12:7 12:16 16:2 32:9	17:11 18:1 27:10	fraud 14:19 35:12 38:17 39:25 40:20
expense 36:19 55:18,20	32:13 34:3 47:18 53:23 56:1 57:6,7	filed 4:1 17:14 27:14 39:6 41:25 49:3 55:8 56:3,4	fraudulent 9:5 10:3,6,6,7 12:15
expensed 50:3	57:21 60:1	files 18:6	13:14,14 14:2
expenses 56:2	factual 24:23 52:20 56:25	filing 10:18 27:23 49:14	20:12 24:19 25:16
expensive 12:4,6	factually 30:15	fill 24:18	32:12 34:13,18,25
expert 9:9 10:13 10:19,20 11:20,22 11:23 12:3 16:12 17:18 18:18 24:14 25:7 35:3 57:1	fails 36:6 52:19	final 52:19	35:1 36:11 37:4
experts 10:10 11:19 16:16 21:5 21:14,21	fair 15:20 17:20 25:19 31:4 35:19 38:6 44:18 54:14 56:18 58:11,25	find 23:6 38:18 40:1 59:17	38:19 40:5 42:1,7 42:10 44:13,19
expressed 35:7	fairly 35:2 55:7 60:15	finding 39:24 59:13	51:20,21,24 52:5
extending 52:25	faith 35:19 36:4,4 37:6,9,19	finds 40:2	52:15,17 53:2
extends 53:3	fake 13:22	fine 18:13 23:4 28:5	56:21 57:13,25
extension 11:8,17 18:12 52:7,9	false 30:16	firm 8:22 21:16	58:4 60:6,7
extensive 35:2	family 33:5	first 8:9 14:21 26:19 36:12 44:4	free 19:1 31:22 45:2
extent 18:15 42:11	far 18:10 30:23 54:21	45:2,2,8 49:11 54:18	friend 12:25
extenuating 48:5	fashion 20:25	five 12:24 49:9	friendship 13:1
f	favoring 36:5	floor 5:5	front 14:12 15:2 15:25 22:5 27:12
f 3:21 17:19 31:20 37:2 63:1	february 48:23 51:13 60:23 61:5 61:8,11 62:10	flow 45:2,6	41:23 57:20,22 58:4 60:5
	federal 3:2 49:18	follow 19:13 21:21	fti 55:8,8

[further - indicate]

Page 8

60:13,18 61:11 future 30:7 42:10 42:12 44:14,20	good 7:2,7,25 8:4 8:18,21 11:1 16:1 19:24 35:18 36:4 37:6,9,19 41:14 54:4 62:18 gotten 53:24 grab 33:23 38:1 grant 40:2 granted 59:25 great 19:19 ground 26:15 group 5:11 7:20 guess 19:11 43:13 50:20 59:24 guidance 59:16 guide 41:6 gyparakis 6:14 8:4,4,7,7,10,12	healthcare 32:16 healthcorp 1:6,12 hear 23:20 hearing 4:1 9:1 18:8,23 25:23 hearings 7:4 heavily 55:7 held 40:24 hesitant 48:9 hesitation 39:16 hey 14:5 33:25 hold 29:9 60:25 61:2 homeowner's 60:4 hon 3:22 honestly 49:4 50:6 honor 8:18,21 9:3 10:4,17 11:1,17 11:21 12:14,25 13:13 14:25 15:11 15:19 17:21,22 18:14 19:4,6,16 19:24 20:3,5,18 21:2,8 22:2,15 23:13,14 24:3,3 24:17 25:13 26:3 26:18,21,23 27:3 27:6,12 29:2,7 30:9 31:2,3 32:7,8 33:21 34:3,19 35:10,24 37:7 38:1,3,11,16,21 38:24 39:11,15,19 40:17,23 41:9,14 43:3,5,21 44:15 44:25 45:1,11 46:15 47:24 49:20 50:7,25 52:1 57:12 58:11,21 59:8,20 60:9 61:16 62:14,15 54:18	hope 11:12 15:18 hoping 10:16 29:13 house 7:22 53:19 53:20 54:5,6,13 howard 1:11,15 4:2 5:4,19 7:9,12 7:15 8:15,19,23 19:23 23:17 26:6 human 54:16 hyde 4:25 63:3,8 hypothetical 42:4 54:5
			i i.e. 38:8 identify 42:23,23 identity 32:24 ilan 5:9 7:8 imbued 42:4 immediate 10:17 immediately 31:6 inadmissible 48:21 50:1 inclined 59:17 include 14:18 18:21 22:23 includes 25:8 including 12:22 33:5 45:16 income 36:20,23 39:1,4 55:15,18 55:24 inconsistent 41:22 incorporate 10:22 incorporated 32:22 incorporates 25:9 incorrectly 46:23 incurred 33:13 index 27:15,18,25 indicate 33:19 36:13

[indicated - length]

Page 9

indicated 20:14 indicating 48:20 indicted 46:20 indicter 44:18 indiscernible 44:17 47:2 49:7 54:7 61:14 62:15 individual 29:25 information 11:13 20:21 initial 14:8 30:3 60:3 inquiry 12:16 insider 37:8 38:8 53:1 insiders 43:9 insolvency 10:13 11:24 12:11 35:8 35:15 39:7,8 42:15 55:6,8 insolvent 35:16 44:19 53:6,15 instances 41:21 instruct 37:10 instructed 32:24 intended 40:7 50:12,13 intending 14:9 intensive 57:19 intent 10:3 13:16 14:10,12 15:8,10 34:23 51:21,24 52:18,24 56:21 intention 10:12 11:20 61:7 intentional 13:14 25:16 60:6 intentionally 10:6 12:15 interest 31:20,22 58:18 interested 35:21 36:3 38:13 58:8	interesting 50:21 interfamily 58:2 interim 20:8 interpretation 41:5 43:14 investments 2:22 involved 9:1 17:16,20 18:7,18 18:23 25:24 26:14 irregardless 36:7 islip 3:3 issue 9:4 13:17 14:24 15:2 16:11 18:20 19:9 20:13 20:17 22:3 23:6 24:23,24 25:8 27:4 28:10,11 36:6 38:20 40:11 40:25 43:17 44:1 46:10 56:10 57:4 58:25 issued 11:3 24:9 24:22 39:20 50:1 issues 12:9 17:13 20:10 22:25 24:22 26:17 42:15 45:12 45:12 it'll 25:6 item 29:25 49:23 55:22 items 48:1	60:25 62:9 judgment 4:1 9:13 10:2,14,18 10:22 12:6 14:9 14:16,22,23 15:7 investments 2:22 involved 9:1 17:16,20 18:7,18 18:23 25:24 26:14 irregardless 36:7 islip 3:3 issue 9:4 13:17 14:24 15:2 16:11 18:20 19:9 20:13 20:17 22:3 23:6 24:23,24 25:8 27:4 28:10,11 36:6 38:20 40:11 40:25 43:17 44:1 46:10 56:10 57:4 58:25 issued 11:3 24:9 24:22 39:20 50:1 issues 12:9 17:13 20:10 22:25 24:22 26:17 42:15 45:12 45:12 it'll 25:6 item 29:25 49:23 55:22 items 48:1	29:24 30:3 31:9,9 31:11,19 32:10 37:15 43:17,19 44:7,17 45:18 48:3,11 49:4 50:1 52:3,7 53:7 54:11 55:4 57:16 59:3 knowing 27:11 knowledge 47:12 knows 13:15 43:23
		j	k
		j 26:8 jacobowitz 58:1 january 3:5 27:2 jeff 7:7 8:18 19:22 23:16 26:5 28:20 31:3 jeffrey 5:8 joint 9:15,17 32:8 jones 5:3 35:2 joseph 7:13,14 judge 3:23 7:3 8:14 23:24 27:21	k 8:7,12 keeping 23:3 kick 60:8 kind 28:17 34:17 know 9:19 10:9 10:21 15:15,18 16:5 17:12 18:2 19:10 20:20 21:4 21:11,14,24 22:10 23:2 24:1,9 25:11 25:14,22 26:19 28:12 29:10,16,19

[letter - nature]

Page 10

letter 9:13,24 11:6 17:25 18:19 level 57:7 liability 10:23 36:18 41:13 lien 29:4 30:25 31:22 liens 28:18 31:23 31:24 limit 12:9 15:2 limited 42:8 limiting 43:3 line 8:25 9:1 13:7 19:11 58:19 lines 46:17 liquidate 31:7 liquidating 1:11 8:20 23:17 listen 7:14 litigation 28:22 29:1 little 24:20 25:2 live 19:11,12 llc 26:8 30:20 32:21 llp 5:3,11 6:1 7:20 loan 12:19,21,23 12:25 13:3,19 14:6 59:11 loaned 11:11 loans 37:14 local 27:24 logical 52:7,9 long 28:22 43:10 look 11:22 17:7 23:11 34:18 53:14 54:12 61:21 looked 12:7 20:16 49:5 looking 11:12 18:2 47:5 51:22 53:7,12	looks 34:17 loss 56:3,5 losses 39:2,7,13 lynch 11:4,12,14 15:12 m m 1:11,15 4:2 5:4 madison 6:3 maintaining 48:13 major 38:8 majority 38:14 making 14:11 malleable 55:14 managed 55:12 management 9:7 20:7,24 21:15 22:6,8 24:4 manager 29:22 46:6 54:15 managers 6:2 7:22 26:10 manages 32:23 manhattan 32:19 manipulated 33:8 33:19 march 16:18,19 16:20,22,23 17:3 17:7,11,14 18:3,3 18:5,8,23 19:8 22:5 24:6 63:25 maryann 5:16 7:17,19 26:7 27:9 44:25 matter 1:5 25:3 45:25 46:23 matters 24:21 maximize 31:7 mean 21:12 25:14 25:17 31:8,13 35:23 36:14,17,21 40:18 42:2 43:15 43:21 45:18 57:21	media 37:11,12 medical 54:11 meet 9:15 mellon 34:16 members 33:5 memorex 19:11 memorialize 34:5 memorializes 36:15 mendelsohn 58:1 merrill 11:4,12,14 15:5,12 18:11 message 15:16 met 20:10 middletown 5:21 mile 5:20 million 20:12,20 32:1,14 34:2,11 36:9,10 37:3 39:3 39:3,4,5 43:25 44:9 46:11,11,11 46:11 48:15,15,16 48:22,25 49:9,12 53:13,13 54:8 59:4,4 mills 7:2 8:24 16:17 23:22 60:22 61:6 62:6 mineola 63:23 missed 25:22 misunderstood 50:14 modify 18:16 moment 50:7 51:25 55:4 monetizable 30:1 monetize 28:14 monetized 29:8 60:19 62:5 monetizing 28:16 money 13:4 16:12 16:15 28:24 29:18 31:9 32:17 34:7	36:23 37:17 41:16 43:8,10,22,24 44:3 50:17 60:2 62:5 monies 13:21 month 9:9,14 26:20 morning 7:2,7,25 8:4,18,21 9:20 11:1,7 15:23 18:17,25 19:24 26:13 48:19 62:7 62:13 motion 4:1 9:13 9:25 10:15,18 14:11,23 15:8 16:4,8 25:23 26:22 27:13 29:14 32:6,11 33:21 35:12 38:16,22,25 46:24 55:12 57:9 60:21 61:8 motions 18:7 59:24 movant 46:24,25 move 10:1 14:9,15 31:6 moved 33:1,10 moving 24:7 multi 20:20 music 50:20 musical 50:20 mute 8:25 9:1
		n n 5:1 7:1 63:1 name 8:6,9,11 27:5,7 37:13 54:6 54:9,13 narrow 14:11,17 28:10 narrowly 41:7 nature 14:20	1652

necessarily 31:8	62:15	officers 37:21	os 48:5
necessary 16:3	nolan's 30:2	53:5	outcome 61:19
42:9	non 45:22,23	offline 17:24	outlining 17:25
need 12:9 16:5	normal 53:17	61:22	outside 18:2
17:12 18:24 23:1	note 12:17	oh 27:6	outstanding 15:10
25:23,25 26:2	notice 18:8 23:10	15:20 19:16 21:9	39:23 53:8,19
40:24 41:1 45:25	25:21 61:6	23:25 27:8 28:6	oversight 31:14
47:14,16 55:1	notified 26:12	54:24	50:6
56:25 57:1,2,2	notify 61:10	old 19:11 63:21	owe 53:17
negative 39:1,2,3	number 8:3 19:21	once 18:1 20:22	owed 15:9 36:9
39:3,4,5,7	23:15 24:8 26:4	23:4 28:3 55:8	37:3,16 42:16
neighbor 12:18	27:15,18 28:1	open 30:23 62:4	43:8,23 46:10,12
net 39:4,7	30:13,14 35:13	operated 32:16	48:15 50:4,17
never 13:24,25	36:21 37:22 40:23	operating 19:15	58:24 59:3,10,14
30:16 36:3 39:21	41:5,8 48:16	29:11 39:7	owing 56:5
43:11 52:4 53:1	ny 5:6 6:11 63:23	opinion 10:13	owned 30:20
new 1:2 3:3 5:6,14	o	32:12 35:8 38:22	owns 32:22
5:14 6:4,4,11 9:6	o 3:21 7:1,12,12	56:8 57:1	p
9:25 10:5 13:9,15	63:1	opinions 12:3	p 5:1,1 7:1 8:7,10
15:3 19:6 27:1	o'clock 22:21,21	57:1,16	8:12
28:16 36:2 37:22	23:11 25:21 26:1	opponent 47:2	p.c. 6:8
38:4,4 39:25	60:23 62:8,18	opportunity	p.m. 62:11
41:10,19 42:24	objection 48:13	11:16 45:16,17	pachulski 5:3 7:8
57:23 59:7	objections 47:9	46:1	page 38:25
nj 5:21	obtain 48:7 52:4	opposed 29:19	paid 13:4,4,20
nolan 5:8 7:7,7	obtained 45:24	30:1 42:9 56:3	14:6 36:9,16 37:9
8:18,19 9:2,3,23	51:3	opposing 9:22	37:14 39:21 43:11
10:4,16 11:3,7,16	obviously 11:22	opposition 33:16	44:3 53:2,4,5,18
12:1,14 14:7,14	12:8 16:4,25 19:1	33:23 34:19 35:23	papers 27:23
14:25 17:21 18:11	23:1 27:11 28:1	38:11 39:18 41:6	34:16 37:11 40:10
19:5,16,22,22	28:11 45:14,16,21	58:7,21 59:23	44:12 48:19 49:8
20:3,4,5 21:8,10	46:3,6,20 47:2,6	options 45:15	49:10 51:1 60:14
22:1,2 23:9,13,16	51:18 53:4 56:22	oral 13:6 59:13	62:11
23:16,20 24:2,3	occupied 33:12	orbach 7:13,14,14	paperwork 27:19
24:17 25:13,20	occupying 32:25	order 18:1,16,20	paragraph 38:11
26:3,5,5 28:20,20	occur 30:13 50:7	19:9 22:23 23:5,6	38:11
28:21 29:2 31:3,3	51:2	23:12 25:8 27:13	paris 6:14 8:4,7
32:5,7 34:22	occurred 33:24	48:3 51:4 56:24	8:10
35:10 36:12 37:7	34:21 41:2 51:4	ordered 18:19	parked 32:21
40:6,17 42:23	offered 28:13	originally 56:4	parlatore 5:11
44:15,23 48:18	officer 38:8,14	orion 1:6,12 16:18	7:19
51:19 52:6 57:11	53:1	21:24	parmar 12:18,25
57:12 61:14,18			13:17,19,21 14:5

35:25 36:8,22 37:3 38:12 46:5,9 46:20 47:3,11,17 48:4,15,21,24 49:11 50:10,15 54:15 58:6,8,10 59:2 parmar's 14:1 part 10:14 45:11 45:24 46:13,18,19 47:25 50:6 particular 41:20 43:25 52:22,23 53:10 56:17 60:21 parties 8:14 9:16 12:8 20:22 22:7 22:24 26:13 27:1 28:14 31:17 32:3 60:17 62:2,5,12 party 40:19 58:17 path 29:14 39:24 40:1 52:9 paths 38:17 pattern 44:7 57:19 pay 30:24 31:23 33:11,14 37:17 39:17 52:4 53:7 53:17,18,21,21,24 payees 45:20 paying 28:17 36:1 56:6 payment 37:9 38:7 payments 35:9 42:16,16,18 payors 45:20 pc 8:1 19:25 pending 52:15,21 52:21 performed 57:24 period 12:24 21:13 47:21 55:23	permitted 30:15 person 8:2 38:13 53:17 personal 12:19,23 13:19 29:22 30:17 33:2,4,5 perspective 29:7 38:17 46:4 petition 39:6 41:24 phone 8:2 11:4 phrased 51:19 pick 31:17,17 32:3 picture 24:18 26:16 28:11 34:17 43:5 pictures 56:6 piece 33:18 pittinsky 6:1,6 7:17,21,21,22 26:9,9,10,18,18 27:16,17,20 28:5 30:9 61:16 62:16 place 9:8 24:4 32:14 places 36:22 plain 52:16 plaintiff 1:13,21 2:4,12,20 4:1 8:19 9:10,11,12 10:12 12:21 13:18 17:9 17:25 18:6 19:5 19:23 23:17 25:1 25:2,24 26:6 29:15 31:4,5 34:21 35:14,20 40:13 52:16,17,22 plaintiff's 26:22 34:19 40:18 44:12 52:3,8 56:23 plaintiffs 10:1 11:22 16:3	plan 9:7 20:7,24 21:10 22:6,9 24:4 24:12 28:22 plans 21:15 plaza 3:2 pleadings 22:3 pleasant 30:25 please 7:4 8:17 9:1 20:4 27:5,5 62:21 plus 49:9 po 5:20 point 10:19 16:5 21:7 28:2 30:4,4 30:10 31:25 43:14 53:3 54:14 pose 42:14 posed 42:5 posing 47:4 position 29:5 48:8 59:21 61:9 possible 15:13 30:7 45:15 possibly 35:6 potentially 12:4,6 15:25 16:10 pre 9:25 25:23,23 61:3 predicant 42:2 prefer 45:3 preferential 37:20 prejudice 34:15 prepared 60:13 present 29:14 45:7 presented 35:3 56:9 president 37:12 presiding 7:3 presumably 46:5 49:14 58:3 presumed 35:16	presumptively 57:25 pretrial 18:5 20:6 21:23,23 22:20 23:3,10 pretty 25:6 prevail 31:5 prevails 28:22 previously 18:16 prior 20:6 21:4 27:23 35:5 probably 16:2 21:11,12 problem 7:17 procedure 62:4 procedures 19:15 31:19 proceed 15:21 26:22 32:6 proceeding 7:16 15:22 27:10 60:20 proceedings 15:24 62:22 63:4 proceeds 31:23 32:1 process 12:6 productive 21:19 21:25 professional 14:4 promissory 12:17 prong 48:17 proper 59:20,25 property 29:17,22 29:25 30:17 31:8 31:21 32:21 33:10 34:8,14 59:4 60:3 60:19 proposed 23:5,12 24:11 proposition 37:23 protocol 19:10 28:14 60:19 62:3
---	---	--	--

[prove - revisit]

Page 13

prove 43:11	raised 40:11	36:24 38:23,24	represent 7:6,15
provide 11:6,8,9	raises 55:24	45:24 48:12 53:14	29:24
20:20 45:15 48:2	range 45:15	57:2	representation
48:6	rationale 43:12	recoveries 40:13	26:24
provider 54:12	read 41:7	recovery 40:10	representative
providing 35:4	ready 16:12 17:10	42:8,19,20	54:16
province 28:13	real 29:17,25	redacted 45:20	representing 7:9
public 45:20,22	32:21 34:7,8 53:5	reduces 55:18	request 11:10,15
pun 50:12,13	55:16	redundant 62:2	requested 9:11,25
purchase 36:9	realized 31:9	references 9:25	requesting 11:5
40:16 42:22 46:13	really 16:14 40:8	reflect 18:18	46:22
49:1,13 50:18	42:5 56:11,24	reflecting 49:4	requests 15:14
55:16	57:19	regard 52:18,23	require 48:2
purchasing 32:25	reason 14:5 25:11	52:23	required 27:22
purpose 41:16	25:25 27:15 41:4	regardless 36:6	requirement
50:23	41:14 42:5 60:8	37:9	37:19
purposes 12:23	61:9	regards 11:13	requires 47:23
18:4 23:9 25:20	reasonable 41:5	27:12	residential 29:12
47:13 49:19 50:17	47:1 56:13	regular 31:7	32:19
60:22	reasonably 14:18	regulations 55:15	resolution 16:11
pushed 39:10	14:19 57:16	relate 15:10	resolve 27:11
put 33:16 39:14	reasons 52:12	related 32:18	resolved 17:20
53:13,22,23 54:8	rebuttal 44:23	relevant 10:13	respect 26:16
puts 48:7	recalibrate 17:18	12:3 15:21 47:12	32:25
putting 28:18	recall 9:4,11	relied 46:24 55:7	respectively 17:6
54:5	received 11:4	rely 13:6 38:23	respond 11:6 15:7
q			
quantifying 43:4	12:22 20:14,15	remedies 40:9	18:1
quarter 33:11	27:25 48:25 49:9	42:6	response 15:7
question 14:8,21	49:12 50:9	remembers 26:23	16:4 17:11 47:13
19:5 40:8,9 42:3,5	receiving 44:2	render 53:15	47:15,18,25
42:6,14 45:5 46:8	48:22	rendering 53:20	rest 28:19
47:16 49:3 52:1,2	recess 62:17	repay 37:14	restraint 30:19
53:5 55:5 56:7,11	recipient 38:7	repayment 38:6	restricted 41:8
questions 44:22	recognizing 17:16	repealed 52:13	result 18:23
45:1,5 56:16,17	recommend 16:14	replace 59:13	retain 11:20,23
56:19,20,22,23	60:17	reply 16:6,6 17:12	retained 35:7 39:5
r		37:11 40:23 41:9	return 47:1 55:13
r 3:21 5:1 7:1,12	record 17:10 28:3	58:9	56:14
8:7,10,12 63:1	42:12 46:9 47:6	report 10:20	returns 49:3 51:2
racking 39:13	48:17,20 51:11	11:22,24 24:9	55:5,11 56:1,3,4
raise 24:23	62:18 63:4	35:11	review 11:23 22:9
	recorded 7:4 44:8	reporting 49:19	revisit 16:13
	records 14:3 34:6		30:17
	36:13,15,18,19,22		

rifle 16:16	s	11:11 12:18,24	settle 19:1
right 8:24 9:2		13:6,20,23 25:3	settled 38:4
10:9,24,24 11:18		25:16	settlement 26:17
12:1 15:4 16:24		se 14:1 40:5 52:5	28:12
18:15,24 19:8,17		second 22:12	share 29:18
19:19 20:2 21:1,3		48:17 60:25 61:2	shareholder 38:9
21:17 22:12,16		section 31:19	38:14
23:25 24:11 25:4		sector 32:17	shareholders
25:19,19 26:12		secured 43:23	37:21
30:8 31:1,16		44:2,4	sheriff's 59:23
40:12,13 43:22		see 22:11 23:23	shipping 38:2
44:11,14,21 51:10		24:12 28:25 30:12	shoes 41:13,22
54:4 57:10 58:4		46:8,16 49:22,25	42:1
60:3,10,10 61:5		seek 30:19	short 11:15,17
61:15,23 62:1,6		seeking 27:22	shot 16:16
62:10		seeks 42:20	show 12:17 27:13
rights 30:12 48:9		seen 11:21 15:12	56:5
ripe 60:1		21:16	showing 13:10
river 5:12 7:20,22		segue 40:7	50:3,8 56:3
26:8 46:13 48:24		self 35:21 36:2	shown 35:23
49:3 54:17		38:12 58:8	shows 35:20
riverhouse 6:2		sell 28:23	shut 19:7
26:10,11		selling 28:17	side 34:23,25 35:1
rivers 49:9 54:16		sense 10:20 21:22	35:12
road 5:20 60:8		22:1 25:4 29:23	sides 35:22 40:9
63:21		58:14	57:3,3 60:11
rosen 6:8,13 7:24		sent 11:6	sign 13:24 23:20
7:25,25,25 8:5		separate 33:13	significant 44:2
19:24,25,25 21:1		39:18 58:16	56:16
21:2 22:13,15		series 47:9	signs 57:24 58:3
23:14		serve 27:23	similar 20:25
rosenberg 6:1		served 27:16	21:15 25:15 34:11
7:21 26:9		services 13:25	34:14 54:18
ruderman 37:13		set 16:9,17 21:13	simple 44:7
rule 21:12 38:5,5		22:17 31:6 35:17	simply 12:5 13:5
45:14 46:24 47:14		36:19 40:10,14,23	21:22 22:8 28:19
47:22 60:13 61:9		41:3,6,9,11 42:15	33:22,24 35:25
rules 27:22,24		43:12,20,24 44:16	51:2,5 58:9
ruling 60:16,24		55:25	single 15:2
61:8,10,18		sets 33:21 38:3,17	situation 43:13
		38:25	48:6 56:13
		setting 16:10 19:9	six 24:22
		21:23 39:12 42:25	

[sold - thank]

Page 15

sold	30:10,23 31:22	stage	59:20	59:5	t
sole	54:16	stand	37:23	submits	t 63:1,1
solely	10:2 11:8 32:23 33:2,3 38:13 51:22 52:22	standing	40:25	submitted	take 8:17 16:16 18:11 19:1 33:18
solutions	63:20	standpoint	54:8		36:23 54:25 58:17
solvency	10:13 11:20 12:3,10,12 12:15 35:3,8,11 36:7 38:20,22 55:6 56:7,8,11,11 56:17 57:1	stang	5:3 7:8		58:17 61:20
solvent	39:17	start	45:4		taken 32:14
somewhat	55:13	started	50:7		talk 15:22 41:15 48:12
sonya	4:25 63:3,8	starting	7:5 8:15		talked 21:5 42:25
soon	61:25	state	27:5,7,10,14 29:2 42:1 49:18 61:22		talking 21:6,20 53:10
sooner	25:25 26:2	statement	9:15,17 32:8 33:13 37:8 39:19		talks 58:2
sorry	24:18 62:20	statements	45:19 48:1		tangible 57:25 58:3
sort	45:2 47:25 53:16 55:4,16	states	1:1 3:1		tax 38:23 48:22 49:3,14,17,19
sorts	29:1	stating	29:16		50:2 51:1 55:5,11
sought	51:17	status	20:4 26:15 42:4 60:12		55:13,15,18,23
sounded	37:1	statute	41:7 52:10 52:12,17 53:3		56:1,3,4
sounds	15:17 22:12 34:24	stay	27:22		taxes 33:14 55:21 56:5,6
southern	28:15 39:22	step	29:4 41:13,25		technically 30:11
sparingly	59:25	stepping	42:25		telephonically 5:8 5:9,16,23 6:6,13 6:14
speak	7:4 9:24 26:25 28:2	steps	41:21		ten 62:7
speaking	26:18 50:7 61:16,22	stigmatize	41:16		tentative 60:23
specific	52:11,14 52:20	stigmatizes	43:7		term 28:22
specifically	31:19 40:24 48:12 53:8 56:12	stipulate	22:8,25		terms 11:18 21:3 23:2 25:5 28:11 30:21 48:8,14
specificity	20:21	stipulated	12:7,16 16:2		terrace 5:12 7:20 26:8 46:14 54:16 54:17
speculating	15:15	stipulation	16:8		testimony 12:22 13:6 59:13
spend	16:11,15	stock	58:17		texas 39:22
split	55:22	stop	27:11		textbook 32:12 34:12 51:20
		strategy	47:5		thank 8:13 10:24 12:1 14:25 18:14 19:16,17,19 23:13
		strike	14:11		
		subject	31:14		
		submission	17:1 23:11 59:12		
		submit	9:15 10:12 17:25 20:23 21:10 22:9 35:11 41:4 45:21 47:17,20		

[thank - unreasonable]

Page 16

23:14 26:3 28:6,8 32:7 57:10 60:9 60:10 61:13 62:14 62:16 them's 41:10 theoretically 50:21 theories 10:23 40:13 theory 25:17 35:17 41:13 thing 33:7 things 27:11 think 10:18 12:16 13:2,9 15:1,1,14 20:22 21:18 22:2 22:8 23:4 24:15 25:13 29:15 31:2 31:4 33:7 34:23 40:9 43:5,6 44:6 54:1,4,7 55:20 56:7,10,15,15,24 57:4,6 59:15 third 5:5 6:10 39:24 40:1 58:17 thought 38:21 50:14 three 41:9 55:20 55:23 60:23 throwing 39:1 tilt 25:24 tilting 17:17 time 9:21 11:5,9 11:24 12:5,9 15:11 17:8,9 18:10 19:13 21:19 24:16 28:18 36:9 39:5 40:3,15 41:12 42:8,16,22 45:11 47:8,14,20 47:20,21 48:3 50:16 51:13 53:15 57:14 60:2 61:1,9	timeline 16:13,15 timing 60:22 title 29:9 32:20 today 7:16 15:25 27:12 32:2 39:23 60:13 today's 18:4 22:20 23:9 25:20 told 13:7 30:22 toss 9:23 touch 40:9 45:12 55:3 track 18:22 20:24 tracking 23:3 tracks 16:9 trade 5:13 traded 54:6 trajectory 25:2 transaction 30:24 33:24 35:15,21,21 35:24 36:3,4,6 37:24 38:13 58:8 transactions 57:24 transcribed 4:25 transcript 63:4 transfer 10:3,6,7 12:15 32:14 34:7 34:8,25 35:1 36:11 37:5 38:19 40:3,5 41:2,12 42:7,8,10 43:1,7 43:12,15,16,19,24 44:9,13,17 46:11 50:2,18,23 51:21 52:5 53:2,7 57:22 59:5 transferee 36:1 38:15 41:14 transferor 12:11 13:17 35:25 38:9 38:15	transferred 42:19 43:9 58:13 transfers 10:14 11:10,25 12:4,12 20:13,15,17,20 35:9 37:20 41:16 46:10 58:2 treat 15:6 trial 12:10 15:23 16:10 17:17 18:20 18:22 22:22 23:4 23:6 24:14 25:8 25:10 47:8 trials 19:6 61:3 tried 12:9 tries 35:24 trigger 28:18 true 34:21 63:4 trust 3:22 7:3 29:10 trustee 1:11 5:4 7:9 8:20 14:22 20:15 23:18 29:9 29:10 31:6 39:12 40:19 41:11,12,21 42:4,20,25 43:11 44:4 47:9 48:13 48:18 51:18 55:6 60:5 trustee's 11:24 14:8 28:22 29:7 32:10,11 42:8 54:7 trustees 41:24 try 12:5 19:14 29:4 33:24 42:14 trying 12:12 21:18 24:24 42:23 turn 32:5 turner 27:21 twisted 44:7 two 11:7 21:11 30:14 38:17 41:8	42:21,24 47:16,25 53:12,12,22,23 55:20,22 56:1,6 61:2,20 tying 13:3 type 37:23 39:16 typically 57:13 u u.s. 3:23 ultimate 16:8 ultimately 31:12 unable 29:13 53:7 53:21 unavailable 47:19 uncontroverted 9:16,17 32:9 underlying 20:17 32:13 understand 14:10 14:16 37:1 46:18 47:24 50:25 understanding 44:12 51:5 understood 17:21 52:6 undisputed 13:4 13:18 35:23 57:21 unearth 29:13 unfortunately 54:20 59:21 unique 29:18 unit 26:16 28:16 28:17,23 29:5,13 30:10,23 33:1,2,3 33:12 46:14 62:4 united 1:1 3:1 49:11 54:18 units 29:11,12 unknown 3:25 unpaid 40:22 unreasonable 53:4
--	--	---	--

[unredacted - à]

Page 17

unredacted	45:21	17:6,18 18:7 26:19 28:12 32:5 44:21,23 45:1,2 51:25 54:22 55:3 57:11 60:13	year	33:11,25 39:1,13 55:18,23
unsatisfied	40:4	44:21,23 45:1,2 51:25 54:22 55:3	years	12:24 55:20 55:24
unsecured	34:15	57:11 60:13	yesterday	9:8 11:5 21:5 27:14
	43:22 44:4	wanted	9:20 33:9	
update	60:12	45:7		
upkeep	33:11	way	29:18 36:12	york
uploaded	20:7	44:15 50:8,8	1:2 3:3 5:6	5:14,14 6:4,4,11
use	13:8 26:1,13 28:15 33:4,9 42:1 60:22 61:2	we've	9:6,25 10:5 13:9	9:6,25 10:5 13:9
utilized	31:10	57:23 59:6 60:2	13:15 15:3 19:6	13:15 15:3 19:6
	v	webex	28:16 36:2 37:22	28:16 36:2 37:22
v	1:14,22 2:5,13 2:21 8:15 37:11 38:2	19:14	38:4,4 39:25	38:4,4 39:25
vacuum	30:13	week	41:10,19 42:24	41:10,19 42:24
valid	13:11 37:15 39:24 41:17	10:11,11,12 11:7 16:10 17:8 21:11 60:15	57:23 59:7	
value	14:19 31:7 34:12,14 57:16	went	yvette	7:2
variables	58:23	13:21 20:10 43:9		z
ventimiglia	59:7	willing	ziehl	5:3 7:8
verdict	47:2 56:14	48:6	zoom	19:6
veritext	63:20	win		à
versus	58:1 59:6	14:17	à	
view	22:14 30:10 40:8	witness	26:21	
violates	37:24 44:17	16:12		
virtue	30:18 41:24	witnesses		
vis	26:21,21	18:18		
visit	25:17	wondering		
voice	62:20	28:24		
voicemail	15:16	word		
voluminous	15:17	12:25 28:15 50:11		
	w	work		
w	36:14	16:1 17:5 22:19 23:4 24:13 26:25		
w2s	49:14	worked		
waiting	15:5 30:12	22:23 22:18		
walia	2:6 6:9 8:1,5	working		
want	7:5 14:22 15:7 16:13,15	16:25		
		world		
		5:13 55:16		
		wound		
		56:5		
		written		
		24:7		
		x		
		x		
		1:4,8,10,17,19 1:25 2:2,8,10,16 2:18,24		
		y		
		y		
		8:7,12		
		yeah		
		16:23 20:5		
		24:17 54:24 55:2		
		61:24		

Page 1

1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

3 Case No. 18-71748-ast

4 Adv. Case No. 8-20-08051-ast

5 - x

6 In the Matter of:

7

8 ORION HEALTHCORP INC.,

9

10 Debtor.

11 - x

12 EHRENBERG,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 ELENA SARTISON et al.,

16 Defendants.

17 - x

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 2

1 **United States Bankruptcy Court**
2 **290 Federal Plaza**
3 **Central Islip, New York 11722**

4

5 **February 9, 2021**

6 **2:30 PM**

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 **B E F O R E :**

22 **HON ALAN S. TRUST**

23 **U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE**

24

25 **ECRO: UNKNOWN**

Page 3

1 HEARING re Liquidating Trustee's Motion to Extend the
2 Deadline to Object to Claims

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

Page 4

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2

3 PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

4 Attorneys for the Plaintiff

5 780 Third Avenue, 34th Floor

6 New York, NY 10017

7

8 BY: JEFFREY NOLAN

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CLERK: Start with 20-8051, Ehrenberg v. Elena
3 Sartison, et al.

4 THE COURT: All right, let me just ask in terms of
5 the status of the adversary proceeding. Has any forward
6 progress been made toward resolution?

7 MR. NOLAN: Your Honor, Jeff Nolan appearing on
8 behalf of the plaintiff. Your Honor, there has been no
9 further progress with the defendant, 2 River Terrace. They
10 had made it clear back in early December that there was no
11 avenue to get this resolved, short of litigating it. I have
12 continued to work with the board of residential managers to
13 try and work through some of the outstanding obligations and
14 basically hold the matter in abeyance while the Court had
15 the time to look at the underlying papers.

16 My understanding is the sheriff's sale was
17 adjourned from the date, which was in the end of January, to
18 a timeframe in the end of February.

19 THE COURT: All right. Any disagreement on the
20 status then of either the sheriff's sale or the resolution
21 efforts? All right.

22 Well, then I'm going to move -- this is Judge
23 Trust. I'm going to moving to the ruling conference portion
24 of this hearing then this afternoon in Adversary Proceeding
25 20-8051. This will be the Court's ruling in narrative form

1 as authorized under Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedures
2 7052.

3 This adversary proceeding presents a number of
4 core proceedings under Title 28, Section 157(b) and 1334.
5 This Court has jurisdiction to hear and determine this
6 adversary proceeding under the standing orders of reference
7 in effect in the Eastern District of New York.

8 In terms of procedural background, the plaintiff
9 brings this action in his capacity as the liquidating
10 trustee of the Orion Healthcorp, Inc. and related debtor
11 entities which had originally filed multiple bankruptcy
12 proceedings, administratively consolidated under Case No.
13 18-71748. I'll talk more about that debtor group in a
14 couple of minutes.

15 This adversary proceeding speaks to recover, among
16 other things, to recover alleged fraudulent transfers under
17 the Federal Bankruptcy Code and the New York debtor and
18 creditor laws concerning the purchase of a multimillion-
19 dollar condominium unit.

20 The plaintiff trustee had moved for default
21 judgment against the defendant entity, 2 River Terrace 12J,
22 LLC. At a hearing on that motion to default judgment, the
23 Court denied that motion given the appearance, albeit late,
24 by the defendant, but that the issues appeared to the Court
25 under Rule 1001 and otherwise to be better addressed on

1 summary judgment.

2 The Court, therefore, set a briefing and
3 submission schedule with respect to summary judgment, held
4 oral argument on January 21st of this year, and then
5 scheduled this ruling conference for today.

6 On the request of the plaintiff for summary
7 judgment, the following facts are either stipulated or there
8 is no genuine issue as to their truth for purposes of this
9 motion. The sources of the facts that the Court is about to
10 recite are contained in the summary judgment record and are
11 drawn from the declaration of Timothy J. Dragelin at then
12 case docket no. 2, which is part of this summary judgment
13 record, the affidavits of Jeffrey Nolan and Daniel Jones,
14 along with the parties' joint Rule 56 statement of
15 undisputed facts -- those can be found at docket items 44,
16 45 and 55 -- as well as certain admissions made by this
17 defendant in this adversary proceeding.

18 And for benefit of the record, when I refer to
19 this defendant, I'm referring to 2 River Terrace as there
20 are multiple defendants in this adversary proceeding, but
21 this summary judgment is only directed at 2 River Terrace.

22 The plaintiff is noted as the liquidating trustee
23 under a liquidating trust agreement which was established
24 under a plan of reorganization confirmed by this Court for
25 multiple debtor entities. Those debtor entities which are

1 the subject of the plan and, therefore, governed under
2 liquidating trust agreement were a consolidated series of
3 companies that were aggregated through a number of
4 acquisitions.

5 The business practice of those entities that did
6 operate were in the healthcare space primarily providing
7 back office revenue and practice management for various
8 physician groups. One of those entities, known as
9 Constellation Healthcare Technologies, which I'll refer to
10 as CHT and is part of the debtor group, is the focus of this
11 adversary proceeding. The debtor, CHT, maintained a
12 checking account at M&T Bank during the relevant time.

13 The defendant, 2 River Terrace entity, is an
14 active domestic limited liability company formed under New
15 York law on December 23rd of 2015. On that same date, Paul
16 Parmar -- the gentleman referred to as Paul Parmar, who at
17 the time was the CEO of CHT, instructed the chief financial
18 officer of CHT, a gentleman called Sam Zaharis, to wire
19 transfer \$545,000 from CHT's bank account at M&T to the
20 account of a law firm -- to the account of Lustrin Tetelman,
21 LLP, who were attorneys at that time acting in the capacity
22 on behalf of the owners of the condominium unit 12J located
23 at the complex known as 2 River Terrace in New York City.

24 At that time, the owners of that condominium unit,
25 which I'll refer to during this ruling as the condo or the

Page 9

1 condo unit, were Clodagh Bowyer Greene and Elliott Greene,
2 and I'll refer to those Greenes as the sellers. The purpose
3 of the \$545,000 wire transfer was as a down payment toward
4 the purchase of the condo, and I'll refer to that as
5 transfer one.

6 On or about February 19th of 2016, Mr. Parmar
7 instructed the CFO of CHT to make a second transfer; that
8 was in the amount of \$5,058,408.81, again, from a CHT bank
9 account at M&T Bank; I'll refer to that as transfer two.
10 Transfer two was directed to the lawyers' trust account held
11 at the law firm of Robinson & Brog; that transfer went
12 directly into escrow.

13 Simultaneously, a closing occurred on the purchase
14 and sale of the condo, again, February 19, 2016. On Mr.
15 Parmar's instructions, the funds comprising transfers one
16 and two, which I'll now collectively refer to as the
17 transfers, were used to pay the purchase price for the
18 condo.

19 The sellers, the Greenes, are also defendants in
20 this adversary proceeding, but this motion is not directed
21 at them. But at the closing, they conveyed title to the
22 condo unit, not to CHT, but to the defendant newly created
23 entity, 2 River Terrace. At all times relevant to this
24 litigation, 2 River Terrace has been managed by Mr. Parmar.
25 Given the undisputed facts, there is no doubt of a close

Page 10

1 connection between CHT, Mr. Parmar, and 2 River Terrace.

2 Subsequent to closing, Mr. Parmar occupied the
3 unit with Elena Sartison, who is also a defendant. The
4 papers refer to Ms. Sartison as her girlfriend; that status
5 for purposes of this ruling is not relevant. The defendant,
6 though, has -- the defendant, 2 River Terrace, has alleged
7 that subsequent to placing title in the name of 2 River
8 Terrace, the condo was in fact used for the conduct of
9 business by one or more employees or officers of one or more
10 debtor entities, including CHT. There is, however, no
11 summary judgment competent summary judgment evidence to that
12 alleged fact.

13 What is also undisputed is that prior to each of
14 the two transfers, at the time of each of the two transfers,
15 and at the time of the closing of the condo purchased, there
16 was no business relationship between 2 River Terrace and the
17 debtor, CHT, not before the closing, not on the date of
18 either transfer, and not thereafter.

19 In addition, prior to, at the time of each of the
20 transfers, at the time of the closing of the condo purchased
21 and for any relevant period of time after, CHT owed no money
22 to 2 River Terrace. There was no business, there was no
23 debt owed to 2 River Terrace by CHT. Thus, as measured at
24 the time of each of the transfers and at the time of the
25 closing of the condo purchase, defendant 2 River Terrace

Page 11

1 received property of debtor worth approximately \$5.6
2 million; CHT received nothing in return. Thus, there was no
3 consideration for the transfers.

4 Subsequent to the closing of the condo purchase, 2
5 River Terrace defaulted in paying certain taxes, utilities
6 and common charges starting in February of 2018. That
7 failure constituted a breach of the covenants of the
8 condominium complex and resulted in the residential board of
9 managers filing suit and then obtaining a judgment against 2
10 River Terrace in the original amount of just over \$200,000.
11 Interest has continued to accrue on that judgment, and the
12 board of managers has sought to execute upon it. As of
13 October 2020, the outstanding debt -- the outstanding amount
14 owing under that judgment put it approximately \$370,000.

15 Included within the records made a part of this
16 summary judgment record are two transactions from 2015. One
17 was a transaction in which CHT acquired an entity in
18 September of 2015 called Phoenix Health, LLC, for \$42
19 million; summary judgment record indicates that Phoenix was
20 a fictitious entity with no business assets or employees.
21 Almost simultaneous with the Phoenix acquisition, CHT
22 acquired another entity called North Star Acquisitions, LLC,
23 that time for \$18 million; that entity, too, had no assets,
24 no business, no employees, and for all purposes, was a
25 fictitious entity.

Page 12

1 Also included in the financial records made a part
2 of the summary judgment record are year-end tax returns of
3 2015 where the consolidating tax reporting group, referred
4 in this litigation to as the debtors; that consolidated
5 federal income tax reflected aggregate net operating losses
6 of over \$11 million for the operating group and a cumulative
7 net income of over \$95 million. Summary judgment record,
8 however, does not include specific financial records solely
9 as to the CHT debtor at the time of either transfer or the
10 closing of the condo.

11 The first issue then with respect to summary
12 judgment concerns whether or not the plaintiff trustee has
13 met his burden to establish entitlement to summary judgment
14 as a matter of law on his claim under New York DCL Section
15 273, arguing that the transfers and the placing of title to
16 the condo in 2 River Terrace was a constructively fraudulent
17 transfer under New York law.

18 This Court has determined, based upon the
19 competent summary judgment, that the trustee is entitled to
20 judgment as a matter of law because the transfers, each of
21 them, and the closing of title to 2 River Terrace were made
22 without fair consideration when CHT either was or was
23 rendered insolvent by those transfers. I'll talk in more
24 detail about those issues.

25 The trustee has also established as a matter of

1 law entitlement to judgment under New York DCL Section 273-
2 a, because a judgment creditor existed prior to each of the
3 transfers and the closing of the title and the transfers
4 were made without fair consideration.

5 Turning to the first DCL 273. As many courts,
6 including the Second Circuit at *In re. Sharp International*,
7 403 F.3d 43 at 53 (2d Cir. 2005) and Judge Strong of this
8 Court in *In re. Allou Distributors*, 446 B.R. 32, 61 to 63
9 (2011), as those courts and many others have held under DCL
10 Section 273, a conveyance made by a debtor is deemed
11 constructively fraudulent if it was made without fair
12 consideration and the transferer is insolvent or is rendered
13 insolvent by the transfer.

14 The undisputed evidence before the Court,
15 undisputed competent evidence is that CHT received no
16 consideration and, therefore, certainly no fair
17 consideration for paying of \$5.5 million, transferring \$5.5
18 million for the purchase of a condo to which title was taken
19 in the name of 2 River Terrace and did not become property
20 of CHT.

21 Since CHT did not receive ownership of the condo
22 or receive any other consideration for either transfer, the
23 question then is what did CHT receive in exchange for the
24 transfers. As Section 272-a of the DCL provides, fair
25 consideration exists when a fair equivalent is received in

Page 14

1 exchange for the property transferred and fair consideration
2 can include the satisfaction of an antecedent debt; that is
3 the prong argued by 2 River Terrace. It asserts that Mr.
4 Parmar was owed millions of dollars by CHT at the time of
5 the transfers and the condo closing. That assertion,
6 however, is an assertion; it's made without any evidentiary
7 support and thus, failed to raise a genuine issue of
8 material fact as to consideration.

9 The specific allegation made by 2 River Terrace is
10 that the debtor, CHT, had entered into one or more
11 consulting agreements with a Parmar-controlled entity called
12 First United Healthcare through which the debtor CHT
13 received the services and Mr. Parmar exchanged for a fixed
14 annual salary of \$650,000 and a bonus based upon a multiple
15 of EBITDA. They assert -- 2 River Terrace asserts that the
16 transfers were made, the condo purchase was made as a result
17 of funds still owed to Mr. Parmar for his services.

18 However, the plaintiff objected to each of the
19 documents provided by the defendant to support this
20 assertion, and there is no affidavit provided to support any
21 of those assertions. But the plaintiff moved to strike all
22 the defendants' exhibits provided in support of this
23 assertion as to consideration for lack of foundation, lack
24 of authenticity and based upon hearsay; see docket item 56.

25 Those objections were discussed at the hearing and

Page 15

1 all of those objections are granted. In fact, 2 River
2 Terrace acknowledged at the oral argument that they did not
3 provide any affidavit or any other factual substantiation
4 from 2 River Terrace, from Mr. Parmar, or from anyone else
5 who could authenticate the documents that were provided
6 and/or testify to the truthfulness of the assertions of the
7 existence of an antecedent debt being owed to Mr. Parmar or
8 to CHT or to any other entity that had any relationship --
9 that then had any relationship to the transfers or the condo
10 purchase.

11 Almost as critical and, therefore, almost as fatal
12 is that there is no evidence in the summary judgment record
13 either that even if an antecedent debt existed, that that
14 debt was satisfied in whole or in part by either of the
15 transfers or the taking of title to the condo in the name of
16 2 River Terrace.

17 It's well-established law that when a party argues
18 facts to support an assertion that a genuine issue of
19 material fact remains and, therefore, summary judgment
20 should be denied, that party in opposing summary judgment
21 must provide competent evidence to establish the counter-
22 narrative.

23 As the Second Circuit long ago held in *Dressler v.*
24 *MV Sandpiper*, 331 F.2d 130 (1964) and as remains the case
25 today, these requirements of evidentiary support are

Page 16

1 mandatory for, quote, "only in this way may the underlying
2 objective of the summary judgment procedure to discover
3 whether one side has no real support for its version of the
4 fact being satisfied."

5 Specifically, in terms of the rule mandate,
6 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 56(c)(4) states that an
7 affidavit or declaration used to support or oppose a summary
8 judgment motion must be made on personal knowledge, set out
9 facts that would be admissible in evidence and show that the
10 affiant or declarant is competent to testify on the matter
11 stated, generically referred to as competent summary
12 judgment evidence.

13 Here, while the defendant, 2 River Terrace, offers
14 an alternate explanation for the transactions at issue,
15 which it claims raises a triable issue of fact, defendant
16 has simply failed to provide any competent summary judgment
17 evidence. When the party offers facts to support its
18 contention it asserted that an issue of fact remains to
19 oppose summary judgment, they must comply with Rule 56(c).
20 Because there was no affidavit submitted by 2 River Terrace
21 authenticating or laying an evidentiary foundation for any
22 of the facts alleged or documents provided, then this Court
23 may and does under Rule 56(e)(2) treat plaintiffs
24 substantiated facts in support of summary judgment,
25 particularly concerning lack of consideration, as

1 undisputed.

2 Therefore, plaintiff has established as a matter
3 of law that CHT received no consideration for either of the
4 transfers or the closing of the title to the condo being
5 taken -- at closing title to the condo being taken to 2 River
6 Terrace while using CHT's funds to do so.

7 While each of the transfers went through lawyers'
8 trust accounts, there is -- that raises no issue of fact,
9 nor concern of law. There's no dispute that each of the
10 transfers were expressly made and earmarked for the purchase
11 of the condo.

12 The issue then is what evidence is before the
13 Court of CHT being or being rendered insolvent at the time
14 of each of the transfers and the closing of the condo
15 purchase. As the Second Circuit held in 2005 in Sharp
16 International and as Judge Strong also held in Allou
17 Distributors, under New York DCL Section 273, there is a
18 long-recognized presumption of insolvency where the debtor
19 makes the conveyance without fair consideration.

20 The Court would also refer the parties to USA
21 United Fleet, 559 B.R. 41 at 60 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 2016), In
22 re. Ventimiglia (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 2007) 362 B.R. 71 at 83,
23 and Feist v. Druckerman (2d Cir. 1934), 70 F.2d 333 at 334.
24 Case law both at the federal level and the state level under
25 New York DCL 273 makes clear that when the presumption of

Page 18

1 insolvency arises, as it does here, the burden then shifts
2 to the transferee to come forward with proof of the
3 transferor's insolvency.

4 Here again, 2 River Terrace has provided no
5 competent summary judgment evidence and specifically, no
6 competent summary judgment evidence that would be adequate
7 to rebut this presumption of insolvency. Therefore, the
8 trustee has established as a matter of law that CHT was
9 insolvent or was rendered insolvent by each of the transfers
10 on the date of each of the transfers and at the date of the
11 closing of the condo purchase; therefore, summary judgment
12 is proper in favor of the plaintiff trustee as a matter of
13 law on the DCL 273 constructive fraudulent transfer claim.

14 With respect to DCL 273-a, as many courts,
15 including Lyman Commerce Solutions v. Lung, 2015 U.S.
16 District Lexis 51447 (S.D.N.Y. 2015) has held, any
17 conveyance made without fair consideration when the person
18 making it is a defendant in an action for money damages or a
19 judgment in such action has been docketed against him, is
20 fraudulent as to the plaintiff in that action without regard
21 to the actual intent of the defendant if, after the final
22 judgment has been entered, the defendant fails to satisfy
23 that judgment.

24 The stipulated facts in the summary judgment
25 record reflects that on December 16 of 2015, a final

Page 19

1 judgment was issued against all of the Orion Healthcorp.,
2 Inc. debtors, including CHT in the United States District
3 Court for the Southern District of Texas in an amount in
4 excess of \$200,000. That litigation existed prior to and
5 resulted in a final judgment being entered prior to the
6 closing of the condo purchase, and that litigation was
7 pending prior to the date of each of the transfers.

8 A proof of claim for that judgment was filed in
9 the main bankruptcy case of CHT and it remains unsatisfied.
10 Facts particular to this judgment are stipulated in the
11 joint statement of undisputed fact at docket item 15; on the
12 facing page, first page of that stipulation is found the
13 definition of the debtors from the Chapter 11 cases, which
14 starts with Orion Healthcorp., Inc. and then Constellation
15 Healthcare Technologies, Inc., and a number of other debtor
16 entities were included in the definition of debtors.

17 At stipulated fact No. 35, the parties agreed as
18 follows: On December 16, 2015, the Southern District of
19 Texas issued a judgment in the amount of \$194,185 against
20 the debtors in favor of former employees, Jack McBride and
21 Alan Nottingham for unpaid deferred compensation. The
22 judgment was filed as a proof of claim in Case No. 8-18-
23 71748 and assigned claim no. 10,001. The filed proof of
24 claim remains unsatisfied, so this is an additional basis
25 upon which is the matter of law the trustee has established

Page 20

1 his entitlement to summary judgment to satisfy each of the
2 transfers and the closing of title to the condo in the name
3 of 2 River Terrace because each of the transfers and the
4 closing of title of the condo were constructively fraudulent
5 under DCL 273 and DCL 273-a and avoidable as to present and
6 future creditors.

7 Each of the transfers and the taking of title to
8 the condo in the name of 2 River Terrace are avoided, the
9 plaintiff is entitled to have all legal and equitable title
10 to the condo transferred to him by 2 River Terrace under
11 Bankruptcy Code Section 544 and 550, along with, as
12 requested, all associated keys and access cards.

13 I'm going to turn briefly to the trustee's claim
14 under New York DCL Section 276, which provides for a
15 conveyance which is made with actual intent to hinder, delay
16 or defraud, to be satisfied both as to present and future
17 creditors as discussed in *MarketXT Holdings*, 376 B.R. 390
18 and *Allou Distributors*.

19 Many courts which have looked at an actual fraud
20 claim under DCL 276 do so by analyzing certain badges of
21 fraud to establish fraudulent intent, which include: (1)
22 gross inadequacy of consideration; (2) a close relationship
23 between transferor and transferee; (3) the transferor's
24 insolvency at or as a result of the conveyance; (4) a
25 questionable transfer not in the ordinary course of

Page 21

1 business; (5) secrecy in the transfer; and (6) retention of
2 control of the property by the transferor after the
3 conveyance.

4 Uncontroverted here is that one of the sellers of
5 the condo was Elliott Greene. His brother, Mitchell Greene,
6 is a lawyer at Robinson & Brog or was at the relevant time,
7 and that at all relevant times, that law firm represented
8 CHT and a number of Mr. Parmar's entities. More
9 specifically, Mitchell Greene represented CHT in the sale
10 transaction of this condo, and Robinson & Brog law firm
11 provided substantial legal services to CHT and various
12 Parmar-related entities, including the debtors, whose
13 definition the Court had just referred to.

14 It's clear that Mr. Parmar retained convention
15 benefit and use of the condo post-closing and as noted, CHT
16 received no consideration for the transfers or the closing
17 of title. Thus, badges (1), (2) and (4) are satisfied on
18 the summary judgment record. However, for purposes of
19 summary judgment, the trustee has not met his burden of
20 proof as to badges (3), (5) and (6), retention of control of
21 the condo was not by the transferor or CHT, but was, in fact
22 and is argued by the trustee, Mr. Parmar. The plaintiff has
23 not established secrecy in this transaction as a matter of
24 law.

25 With respect to insolvency, while the case law is

Page 22

1 clear that it is presumed in a constructive fraudulent
2 transaction, parties have not provided briefing and the
3 Court is not prepared to conclude that insolvency should be
4 presumed in an actual fraud transaction and, in fact, an
5 actual fraud transaction can be found in the absence of
6 insolvency.

7 But here, there's no independent evidence of
8 insolvency as to CHT in and of itself at the time of each of
9 the transfers. Thus, while insolvency has been demonstrated
10 for purposes of constructive fraud based upon the
11 presumption, the Court is not prepared to find insolvency
12 has been established for purposes of actual fraud.

13 With respect to intent to hinder, delay or defraud
14 creditors, this Court has limited evidence from which to
15 draw an inference as to Mr. Parmar's intent at the time he
16 authorized or directed each of the transfers to be made and
17 for title to be closed into 2 River Terrace, that the Court
18 is determined not to grant summary judgment on this record
19 on the actual intent claim.

20 The Court has also not today reached the
21 plaintiff's other request for relief as against 2 River
22 Terrace for a monetary judgment in the amount of a judgment
23 lien held by the board or the request for attorneys' fees.

24 The Court is, therefore, granting partial summary
25 judgment, avoiding the transfers, each of the transfers and

Page 23

1 the closing of title into 2 River Terrace as constructively
2 fraudulent. Plaintiff is entitled to have all legal and
3 equitable title to the condo transferred to him by 2 River
4 Terrace under Bankruptcy Code Sections 544 and 550, along
5 with all associated keys and access cards.

6 As you know and I'll direct that your office
7 prepare a form of partial judgment, please submit that to --
8 circulate it each of the defendants prior to submission to
9 the Court. I'd like to get that judgment in as quickly as
10 possible, so we'll say -- today is Tuesday, Monday is a non-
11 business day, so by Wednesday of next week, that would be
12 February 17th. I'd like to have the judgment submitted by
13 the Court, so you should get that out by the end of the day
14 tomorrow, if at all possible, so that the parties have at
15 least two full business days to review it before submission
16 to the Court.

17 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: All right. With respect to proceeding
19 to next steps, I'm going to hold an adjourned -- a further
20 adjourned pretrial conference on March 9th at 2:00 p.m. At
21 that point, we can discuss the further charting of this
22 litigation for a trial on the remaining issues.

23 So, Mr. Nolan, if your office will docket notice
24 of adjournment and serve that on all defendants, March 9th
25 at 2:00 p.m.

Page 24

1 MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

2 THE COURT: All right. That will then conclude
3 the ruling conference and the pretrial conference in 20-
4 8051. The Court will be in recess and we'll go off the
5 record. Thank you.

6 MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 25

1 | INDEX

2

RULINGS

4

Page **Line**

5

6 Motion to Extend Time Granted

22 24

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 26

1 C E R T I F I C A T I O N

2

3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing
4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

5

6

7

8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 Veritext Legal Solutions

21 330 Old Country Road

22 Suite 300

23 Mineola, NY 11501

24

25 Date: February 16, 2021

[& - affidavits]

Page 1

&			a
& 4:3 9:11 21:6 21:10	2005 13:7 17:15 2007 17:22 2011 13:9 2015 8:15 11:16 11:18 12:3 18:15 18:16,25 19:18	42 11:18 43 13:7 44 7:15 446 13:8 45 7:16	abeyance 5:14 absence 22:5 access 20:12 23:5 account 8:12,19 8:20,20 9:9,10 accounts 17:8 accrue 11:11 accurate 26:4 acknowledged 15:2
1	2016 9:6,14 17:21 2018 11:6 2020 11:13 2021 2:5 26:25 21st 7:4 22 25:6 23rd 8:15 24 25:6 272 13:24 273 12:15 13:1,5 13:10 17:17,25 18:13,14 20:5,5 276 20:14,20 28 6:4 290 2:2 2:00 23:20,25 2:30 2:6 2d 13:7 17:23	5 5 21:1,20 5,058,408.81 9:8 5.5 13:17,17 5.6 11:1 51447 18:16 53 13:7 544 20:11 23:4 545,000 8:19 9:3 55 7:16 550 20:11 23:4 559 17:21 56 7:14 14:24 16:6 16:19,23	acquired 11:17,22 acquisition 11:21 acquisitions 8:4 11:22 acting 8:21 action 6:9 18:18 18:19,20 active 8:14 actual 18:21 20:15,19 22:4,5 22:12,19 addition 10:19 additional 19:24 addressed 6:25 adequate 18:6 adjourned 5:17 23:19,20 adjournment 23:24 administratively 6:12 admissible 16:9 admissions 7:16 adv 1:4 adversary 5:5,24 6:3,6,15 7:17,20 8:11 9:20 affiant 16:10 affidavit 14:20 15:3 16:7,20 affidavits 7:13
2	3 20:23 21:20 300 26:22 32 13:8 330 26:21 331 15:24 333 17:23 334 17:23 34th 4:5 35 19:17 362 17:22 370,000 11:14 376 20:17 390 20:17	6 6 21:1,20 60 17:21 61 13:8 63 13:8 650,000 14:14	70 17:23 7052 6:2 71 17:22 71748 19:23 780 4:5
3		7	8
4	4 16:6 20:24 21:17 403 13:7 41 17:21	8-18 19:22 8-20-08051 1:4 8051 24:4 83 17:22	9 9 2:5 95 12:7 9th 23:20,24

[afternoon - comprising]

Page 2

afternoon 5:24	assets 11:20,23	bowyer 9:1	21:21 22:8
aggregate 12:5	assigned 19:23	breach 11:7	cht's 8:19 17:6
aggregated 8:3	associated 20:12	briefing 7:2 22:2	cir 13:7 17:23
ago 15:23	23:5	briefly 20:13	circuit 13:6 15:23
agreed 19:17	ast 1:3,4	brings 6:9	17:15
agreement 7:23	attorneys 4:4 8:21	brog 9:11 21:6,10	circulate 23:8
8:2	22:23	brother 21:5	city 8:23
agreements 14:11	authenticate 15:5	burden 12:13	civil 16:6
al 1:15 5:3	authenticating	18:1 21:19	claim 12:14 18:13
alan 2:22 19:21	authenticity	business 8:5 10:9	19:8,22,23,24
albeit 6:23	14:24	10:16,22 11:20,24	20:13,20 22:19
allegation 14:9	authorized 6:1	21:1 23:11,15	claims 3:2 16:15
alleged 6:16 10:6	22:16	c	clear 5:10 17:25
10:12 16:22	avenue 4:5 5:11	c 4:1 5:1 16:6,19	21:14 22:1
allou 13:8 17:16	avoidable 20:5	26:1,1	clerk 5:2
20:18	avoided 20:8	called 8:18 11:18	clodagh 9:1
alternate 16:14	avoiding 22:25	11:22 14:11	close 9:25 20:22
amount 9:8 11:10	b	capacity 6:9 8:21	closed 22:17
11:13 19:3,19	b 2:21 6:4	cards 20:12 23:5	closing 9:13,21
22:22	b.r. 13:8 17:21,22	case 1:3,4 6:12	10:2,15,17,20,25
analyzing 20:20	20:17	7:12 15:24 17:24	11:4 12:10,21
annual 14:14	back 5:10 8:7	19:9,22 21:25	13:3 14:5 17:4,5
antecedent 14:2	background 6:8	cases 19:13	17:14 18:11 19:6
15:7,13	badges 20:20	central 2:3	20:2,4 21:15,16
appearance 6:23	21:17,20	ceo 8:17	23:1
appeared 6:24	bank 8:12,19 9:8	certain 7:16 11:5	code 6:17 20:11
appearing 5:7	9:9	20:20	23:4
approximately	bankr 17:21,22	certainly 13:16	collectively 9:16
11:1,14	bankruptcy 1:1	certified 26:3	come 18:2
argued 14:3 21:22	2:1,23 6:1,11,17	cfo 9:7	commerce 18:15
argues 15:17	19:9 20:11 23:4	chapter 19:13	common 11:6
arguing 12:15	based 12:18 14:14	charges 11:6	companies 8:3
argument 7:4	14:24 22:10	charting 23:21	company 8:14
15:2	basically 5:14	checking 8:12	compensation
arises 18:1	basis 19:24	chief 8:17	19:21
assert 14:15	behalf 5:8 8:22	cht 8:10,11,17,18	competent 10:11
asserted 16:18	benefit 7:18 21:15	9:7,8,22 10:1,10	12:19 13:15 15:21
assertion 14:5,6	better 6:25	10:17,21,23 11:2	16:10,11,16 18:5
14:20,23 15:18	board 5:12 11:8	11:17,21 12:9,22	18:6
assertions 14:21	11:12 22:23	13:15,20,21,23	complex 8:23 11:8
15:6	bonus 14:14	14:4,10,12 15:8	comply 16:19
asserts 14:3,15		17:3,13 18:8 19:2	comprising 9:15
		19:9 21:8,9,11,15	

[concern - eastern]

Page 3

concern 17:9 concerning 6:18 16:25 concerns 12:12 conclude 22:3 24:2 concluded 24:7 condo 8:25 9:1,4 9:14,18,22 10:8 10:15,20,25 11:4 12:10,16 13:18,21 14:5,16 15:9,15 17:4,5,11,14 18:11 19:6 20:2,4 20:8,10 21:5,10 21:15,21 23:3 condominium 6:19 8:22,24 11:8 conduct 10:8 conference 5:23 7:5 23:20 24:3,3 confirmed 7:24 connection 10:1 consideration 11:3 12:22 13:4 13:12,16,17,22,25 14:1,8,23 16:25 17:3,19 18:17 20:22 21:16 consolidated 6:12 8:2 12:4 consolidating 12:3 constellation 8:9 19:14 constituted 11:7 constructive 18:13 22:1,10 constructively 12:16 13:11 20:4 23:1 consulting 14:11	contained 7:10 contention 16:18 continued 5:12 11:11 control 21:2,20 controlled 14:11 convention 21:14 conveyance 13:10 17:19 18:17 20:15 20:24 21:3 conveyed 9:21 core 6:4 counter 15:21 country 26:21 couple 6:14 course 20:25 court 1:1 2:1 5:4 5:14,19 6:5,23,24 7:2,9,24 12:18 13:8,14 16:22 17:13,20 19:3 21:13 22:3,11,14 22:17,20,24 23:9 23:13,16,18 24:2 24:4 court's 5:25 courts 13:5,9 18:14 20:19 covenants 11:7 created 9:22 creditor 6:18 13:2 creditors 20:6,17 22:14 critical 15:11 cumulative 12:6	day 23:11,13 days 23:15 dcl 12:14 13:1,5,9 13:24 17:17,25 18:13,14 20:5,5 20:14,20 deadline 3:2 debt 10:23 11:13 14:2 15:7,13,14 debtor 1:10 6:10 6:13,17 7:25,25 8:10,11 10:10,17 11:1 12:9 13:10 14:10,12 17:18 19:15 debtors 12:4 19:2 19:13,16,20 21:12 december 5:10 8:15 18:25 19:18 declarant 16:10 declaration 7:11 16:7 deemed 13:10 default 6:20,22 defaulted 11:5 defendant 5:9 6:21,24 7:17,19 8:13 9:22 10:3,5,6 10:25 14:19 16:13 16:15 18:18,21,22 defendants 1:16 7:20 9:19 14:22 23:8,24 deferred 19:21 definition 19:13 19:16 21:13 defraud 20:16 22:13 delay 20:15 22:13 demonstrated 22:9 denied 6:23 15:20	detail 12:24 determine 6:5 determined 12:18 22:18 direct 23:6 directed 7:21 9:10 9:20 22:16 directly 9:12 disagreement 5:19 discover 16:2 discuss 23:21 discussed 14:25 20:17 dispute 17:9 distributors 13:8 17:17 20:18 district 1:2 6:7 18:16 19:2,3,18 docket 7:12,15 14:24 19:11 23:23 docketed 18:19 documents 14:19 15:5 16:22 dollar 6:19 dollars 14:4 domestic 8:14 doubt 9:25 dragelin 7:11 draw 22:15 drawn 7:11 dressler 15:23 druckerman 17:23
			e
			e 2:21,21 4:1,1 5:1 5:1 16:23 25:1 26:1 e.d.n.y. 17:21,22 early 5:10 earmarked 17:10 eastern 1:2 6:7

[ebitda - honor]

Page 4

ebitda 14:15	evidentiary 14:6 15:25 16:21	feist 17:23	g
ecro 2:25	excess 19:4	fictitious 11:20,25	g 5:1
effect 6:7	exchange 13:23 14:1	filed 6:11 19:8,22 19:23	generically 16:11
efforts 5:21	exchanged 14:13	filings 11:9	gentleman 8:16 8:18
ehrenberg 1:12 5:2	execute 11:12	final 18:21,25 19:5	genuine 7:8 14:7 15:18
either 5:20 7:7 10:18 12:9,22 13:22 15:13,14 17:3	exhibits 14:22	financial 8:17 12:1,8	girlfriend 10:4
elena 1:15 5:2 10:3	existed 13:2 15:13 19:4	find 22:11	given 6:23 9:25
elliott 9:1 21:5	existence 15:7	firm 8:20 9:11 21:7,10	go 24:4
employees 10:9 11:20,24 19:20	exists 13:25	first 12:11 13:5 14:12 19:12	going 5:22,23 20:13 23:19
entered 14:10 18:22 19:5	explanation 16:14	fixed 14:13	governed 8:1
entities 6:11 7:25 7:25 8:5,8 10:10 19:16 21:8,12	expressly 17:10	fleet 17:21	grant 22:18
entitled 12:19 20:9 23:2	extend 3:1 25:6	floor 4:5	granted 15:1 25:6
entitlement 12:13 13:1 20:1	f	focus 8:10	granting 22:24
entity 6:21 8:13 9:23 11:17,20,22 11:23,25 14:11 15:8	f 2:21 26:1	following 7:7	greene 9:1,1 21:5 21:5,9
equitable 20:9 23:3	f.2d 15:24 17:23	follows 19:18	greenes 9:2,19
equivalent 13:25	f.3d 13:7	foregoing 26:3	gross 20:22
escrow 9:12	facing 19:12	form 5:25 23:7	group 6:13 8:10 12:3,6
establish 12:13 15:21 20:21	fact 10:8,12 14:8 15:1,19 16:4,15 16:18 17:8 19:11 19:17 21:21 22:4	formed 8:14	groups 8:8
established 7:23 12:25 15:17 17:2 18:8 19:25 21:23 22:12	facts 7:7,9,15 9:25 15:18 16:9,17,22 16:24 18:24 19:10	former 19:20	h
et 1:15 5:3	factual 15:3	forward 5:5 18:2	health 11:18
evidence 10:11 13:14,15 15:12,21 16:9,12,17 17:12 18:5,6 22:7,14	failed 14:7 16:16	found 7:15 19:12 22:5	healthcare 8:6,9 14:12 19:15
	fails 18:22	foundation 14:23 16:21	healthcorp 1:8 6:10 19:1,14
	failure 11:7	fraud 20:19,21 22:4,5,10,12	hear 6:5
	fair 12:22 13:4,11 13:16,24,25 14:1 17:19 18:17	fraudulent 6:16 12:16 13:11 18:13 18:20 20:4,21 22:1 23:2	hearing 3:1 5:24 6:22 14:25
	fatal 15:11	full 23:15	hearsay 14:24
	favor 18:12 19:20	funds 9:15 14:17 17:6	held 7:3 9:10 13:9 15:23 17:15,16 18:16 22:23
	february 2:5 5:18 9:6,14 11:6 23:12 26:25	further 5:9 23:19 23:21	hinder 20:15 22:13
	federal 2:2 6:1,17 12:5 16:6 17:24	future 20:6,16	hold 5:14 23:19
	fees 22:23		holdings 20:17
			hon 2:22
			honor 5:7,8 23:17 24:1,6

[hyde - nottingham]

Page 5

hyde 3:25 26:3,8	jeff 5:7 jeffrey 4:8 7:13 joint 7:14 19:11 jones 4:3 7:13 judge 2:23 5:22 13:7 17:16 judgment 6:21,22 7:1,3,7,10,12,21 10:11,11 11:9,11 11:14,16,19 12:2 12:7,12,13,19,20 13:1,2 15:12,19 15:20 16:2,8,12 16:16,19,24 18:5 18:6,11,19,22,23 18:24 19:1,5,8,10 19:19,22 20:1 21:18,19 22:18,22 22:22,25 23:7,9 23:12 jurisdiction 6:5	level 17:24,24 lexis 18:16 liability 8:14 lien 22:23 limited 8:14 22:14 line 25:4 liquidating 3:1 6:9 7:22,23 8:2 litigating 5:11 litigation 9:24 12:4 19:4,6 23:22 llc 6:22 11:18,22 llp 4:3 8:21 located 8:22 long 15:23 17:18 look 5:15 looked 20:19 losses 12:5 lung 18:15 lustrin 8:20 lyman 18:15	met 12:13 21:19 million 11:2,19,23 12:6,7 13:17,18 millions 14:4 mineola 26:23 minutes 6:14 mitchell 21:5,9 monday 23:10 monetary 22:22 money 10:21 18:18 motion 3:1 6:22 6:23 7:9 9:20 16:8 25:6 move 5:22 moved 6:20 14:21 moving 5:23 multimillion 6:18 multiple 6:11 7:20 7:25 14:14 mv 15:24
	k	m	n
	keys 20:12 23:5 know 23:6 knowledge 16:8 known 8:8,23	m&t 8:12,19 9:9 main 19:9 maintained 8:11 making 18:18 managed 9:24 management 8:7	n 4:1 5:1 25:1 26:1 name 10:7 13:19 15:15 20:2,8 narrative 5:25 15:22 net 12:5,7 new 1:2 2:3 4:6 6:7,17 8:14,23 12:14,17 13:1 17:17,25 20:14 newly 9:22 nolan 4:8 5:7,7 7:13 23:17,23 24:1,6 non 23:10 north 11:22 noted 7:22 21:15 notice 23:23 nottingham 19:21
	late 6:23 law 8:15,20 9:11 12:14,17,20 13:1 15:17 17:3,9,24 18:8,13 19:25 21:7,10,24,25 laws 6:18 lawyer 21:6 lawyers 9:10 17:7 laying 16:21 ledanski 3:25 26:3 26:8 legal 20:9 21:11 23:2 26:20	managers 5:12 11:9,12 mandate 16:5 mandatory 16:1 march 23:20,24 marketxt 20:17 material 14:8 15:19 matter 1:6 5:14 12:14,20,25 16:10 17:2 18:8,12 19:25 21:23 mcbride 19:20 measured 10:23	
j	j 7:11 jack 19:20 january 5:17 7:4		

[number - refer]

Page 6

number 6:3 8:3 19:15 21:8 ny 4:6 26:23	page 19:12,12 25:4 papers 5:15 10:4 parmar 8:16,16 9:6,24 10:1,2 14:4 14:11,13,17 15:4 15:7 21:12,14,22 parmar's 9:15 21:8 22:15 part 7:12 8:10 11:15 12:1 15:14 partial 22:24 23:7 particular 19:10 particularly 16:25 parties 7:14 17:20 19:17 22:2 23:14 party 15:17,20 16:17 paul 8:15,16 pay 9:17 paying 11:5 13:17 payment 9:3 pending 19:7 period 10:21 person 18:17 personal 16:8 phoenix 11:18,19 11:21 physician 8:8 placing 10:7 12:15 plaintiff 1:13 4:4 5:8 6:8,20 7:6,22 12:12 14:18,21 17:2 18:12,20 20:9 21:22 23:2 plaintiff's 22:21 plaintiffs 16:23 plan 7:24 8:1 plaza 2:2 please 23:7	pm 2:6 point 23:21 portion 5:23 possible 23:10,14 post 21:15 practice 8:5,7 prepare 23:7 prepared 22:3,11 present 20:5,16 presents 6:3 presumed 22:1,4 presumption 17:18,25 18:7 22:11 pretrial 23:20 24:3 price 9:17 primarily 8:6 prior 10:13,19 13:2 19:4,5,7 23:8 procedural 6:8 procedure 16:2,6 procedures 6:1 proceeding 5:5,24 6:3,6,15 7:17,20 8:11 9:20 23:18 proceedings 6:4 6:12 24:7 26:4 progress 5:6,9 prong 14:3 proof 18:2 19:8 19:22,23 21:20 proper 18:12 property 11:1 13:19 14:1 21:2 provide 15:3,21 16:16 provided 14:19,20 14:22 15:5 16:22 18:4 21:11 22:2 provides 13:24 20:14	providing 8:6 purchase 6:18 9:4 9:13,17 10:25 11:4 13:18 14:16 15:10 17:10,15 18:11 19:6 purchased 10:15 10:20 purpose 9:2 purposes 7:8 10:5 11:24 21:18 22:10 22:12 put 11:14
			q question 13:23 questionable 20:25 quickly 23:9 quote 16:1

r

r 2:21 4:1 5:1 26:1
raise 14:7
raises 16:15 17:8
reached 22:20
real 16:3
rebut 18:7
receive 13:21,22
13:23
received 11:1,2
13:15,25 14:13
17:3 21:16
recess 24:4
recite 7:10
recognized 17:18
record 7:10,13,18
11:16,19 12:2,7
15:12 18:25 21:18
22:18 24:5 26:4
records 11:15
12:1,8
recover 6:15,16
refer 7:18 8:9,25
9:2,4,9,16 10:4

[refer - take]

Page 7

17:20 reference 6:6 referred 8:16 12:3 16:11 21:13 referring 7:19 reflected 12:5 reflects 18:25 regard 18:20 related 6:10 21:12 relationship 10:16 15:8,9 20:22 relevant 8:12 9:23 10:5,21 21:6,7 relief 22:21 remaining 23:22 remains 15:19,24 16:18 19:9,24 rendered 12:23 13:12 17:13 18:9 reorganization 7:24 reporting 12:3 represented 21:7 21:9 request 7:6 22:21 22:23 requested 20:12 requirements 15:25 residential 5:12 11:8 resolution 5:6,20 resolved 5:11 respect 7:3 12:11 18:14 21:25 22:13 23:18 result 14:16 20:24 resulted 11:8 19:5 retained 21:14 retention 21:1,20 return 11:2	returns 12:2 revenue 8:7 review 23:15 right 5:4,19,21 23:18 24:2 river 5:9 6:21 7:19,21 8:13,23 9:23,24 10:1,6,7 10:16,22,23,25 11:5,10 12:16,21 13:19 14:3,9,15 15:1,4,16 16:13 16:20 17:5 18:4 20:3,8,10 22:17 22:21 23:1,3 road 26:21 robinson 9:11 21:6,10 rule 6:25 7:14 16:5,19,23 rules 6:1 16:6 ruling 5:23,25 7:5 8:25 10:5 24:3 rulings 25:3 s s 2:22 4:1 5:1 s.d.n.y. 18:16 salary 14:14 sale 5:16,20 9:14 21:9 sam 8:18 sandpiper 15:24 sartison 1:15 5:3 10:3,4 satisfaction 14:2 satisfied 15:14 16:4 20:16 21:17 satisfy 18:22 20:1 schedule 7:3 scheduled 7:5 second 9:7 13:6 15:23 17:15	secrecy 21:1,23 section 6:4 12:14 13:1,10,24 17:17 20:11,14 sections 23:4 see 14:24 sellers 9:2,19 21:4 september 11:18 series 8:2 serve 23:24 services 14:13,17 21:11 set 7:2 16:8 sharp 13:6 17:15 sheriff's 5:16,20 shifts 18:1 short 5:11 show 16:9 side 16:3 simply 16:16 simultaneous 11:21 simultaneously 9:13 solely 12:8 solutions 18:15 26:20 sonya 3:25 26:3,8 sought 11:12 sources 7:9 southern 19:3,18 space 8:6 speaks 6:15 specific 12:8 14:9 specifically 16:5 18:5 21:9 standing 6:6 stang 4:3 star 11:22 start 5:2 starting 11:6 starts 19:14	state 17:24 stated 16:11 statement 7:14 19:11 states 1:1 2:1 16:6 19:2 status 5:5,20 10:4 steps 23:19 stipulated 7:7 18:24 19:10,17 stipulation 19:12 strike 14:21 strong 13:7 17:16 subject 8:1 submission 7:3 23:8,15 submit 23:7 submitted 16:20 23:12 subsequent 10:2,7 11:4 substantial 21:11 substantiated 16:24 substantiation 15:3 suit 11:9 suite 26:22 summary 7:1,3,6 7:10,12,21 10:11 10:11 11:16,19 12:2,7,11,13,19 15:12,19,20 16:2 16:7,11,16,19,24 18:5,6,11,24 20:1 21:18,19 22:18,24 support 14:7,19 14:20,22 15:18,25 16:3,7,17,24 t t 26:1,1 take 17:5
---	---	---	--

taken	13:18 17:5	transactions	11:16 16:14	truth	7:8	week	23:11
talk	6:13 12:23	transcribed	3:25	truthfulness	15:6	went	9:11 17:7
tax	12:2,3,5	transcript	26:4	try	5:13	wire	8:18 9:3
taxes	11:5	transfer	8:19 9:3 9:5,7,9,10,11 10:18 12:9,17 13:13,22 18:13 20:25 21:1	tuesday	23:10	work	5:12,13
technologies	8:9 19:15	transferee	18:2 20:23	turn	20:13	worth	11:1
terms	5:4 6:8 16:5	transferer	13:12	turning	13:5	x	
terrace	5:9 6:21 7:19,21 8:13,23 9:23,24 10:1,6,8 10:16,22,23,25 11:5,10 12:16,21 13:19 14:3,9,15 15:2,4,16 16:13 16:20 17:6 18:4 20:3,8,10 22:17 22:22 23:1,4	transferor	20:23 21:2,21	two	9:9,10,16 10:14,14 11:16 23:15	x	1:5,11,17 25:1
testify	15:6 16:10	transferor's	18:3 20:23	underlying	5:15 16:1	y	
telelman	8:20	transferred	14:1 20:10 23:3	understanding	5:16	year	7:4 12:2
texas	19:3,19	transferring	13:17	undisputed	7:15 9:25 10:13 13:14 13:15 17:1 19:11	york	1:2 2:3 4:6 6:7,17 8:15,23 12:14,17 13:1 17:17,25 20:14
thank	24:1,5,6	transfers	6:16 9:15,17 10:14,14 10:20,24 11:3 12:15,20,23 13:3 13:3,24 14:5,16 15:9,15 17:4,7,10 17:14 18:9,10 19:7 20:2,3,7 21:16 22:9,16,25 22:25	unit	6:19 8:22,24 9:1,22 10:3	z	
things	6:16	treat	16:23	united	1:1 2:1 14:12 17:21 19:2	zaharis	8:18
third	4:5	trieable	16:15	unknown	2:25	ziehl	4:3
time	5:15 8:12,17 8:21,24 10:14,15 10:19,20,21,24,24 11:23 12:9 14:4 17:13 21:6 22:8 22:15 25:6	trial	23:22	unpaid	19:21		
timeframe	5:18	true	26:4	unsatisfied	19:9 19:24		
times	9:23 21:7	trust	2:22 5:23 7:23 8:2 9:10 17:8	usa	17:20		
timothy	7:11	trustee	6:10,20 7:22 12:12,19,25 18:8,12 19:25 21:19,22	use	21:15		
title	6:4 9:21 10:7 12:15,21 13:3,18 15:15 17:4,5 20:2 20:4,7,9 21:17 22:17 23:1,3	trustee's	20:13 trustee's 3:1	utilities	11:5		
today	7:5 15:25 22:20 23:10			v			
tomorrow	23:14			v	1:14 5:2 15:23 17:23 18:15		
transaction	11:17 21:10,23 22:2,4,5			various	8:7 21:11		
				ventimiglia	17:22		
				veritext	26:20		
				version	16:3		
				w			
				way	16:1		
				wednesday	23:11		

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:	:	Chapter 11
ORION HEALTHCORP, INC ¹ .	:	Case No. 18-71748 (AST)
Debtors.	:	(Jointly Administered)
HOWARD M. EHRENBURG IN HIS CAPACITY AS LIQUIDATING TRUSTEE OF ORION HEALTHCORP, INC., ET AL.,	:	Adv. Pro. No. 20-08051 (AST)
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
ELENA SARTISON; 2 RIVER TERRACE APARTMENT 12J, LLC; CLODAGH BOWYER GREENE A/K/A CLODAGH BOWYER; ELLIOTT GREENE,	:	
Defendants.	:	

**JOINT STATEMENT OF PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANT OF UNCONTROVERTED
FACTS WITH REFERENCE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY ADJUDICATION**

¹ The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, are: Orion Healthcorp, Inc. (7246); Constellation Healthcare Technologies, Inc. (0135); NEMS Acquisition, LLC (7378); Northeast Medical Solutions, LLC (2703); NEMS West Virginia, LLC (unknown); Physicians Practice Plus Holdings, LLC (6100); Physicians Practice Plus, LLC (4122); Medical Billing Services, Inc. (2971); Rand Medical Billing, Inc. (7887); RMI Physician Services Corporation (7239); Western Skies Practice Management, Inc. (1904); Integrated Physician Solutions, Inc. (0543); NYNM Acquisition, LLC (unknown) Northstar FHA, LLC (unknown); Northstar First Health, LLC (unknown); Vachette Business Services, Ltd. (4672); Phoenix Health, LLC (0856); MDRX Medical Billing, LLC (5410); VEGA Medical Professionals, LLC (1055); Allegiance Consulting Associates, LLC (7291); Allegiance Billing & Consulting, LLC (7141); New York Network Management, LLC (7168). The corporate headquarters and the mailing address for the Debtors listed above is 1715 Route 35 North, Suite 303, Middletown, NJ 07748.

Comes now Plaintiff, Howard M. Ehrenberg In His Capacity As Liquidating Trustee Of Orion Healthcorp, Inc., Et Al., and Defendant 2 River Terrace Apartment 12J, LLC, with respect to the Plaintiff's Motion For Summary Judgment, Or In The Alternative Summary Adjudication, and submit a Joint Statement of Facts:

I. Purchase of the Condominium Unit

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
1.	<p>The Debtors were a consolidated enterprise of several companies aggregated through a series of acquisitions which operated in the healthcare sector primarily in revenue and practice management for physician practices.</p> <p>(See Declaration of Timothy J. Dragelin, ¶11, Dkt No. 2, Case no. 8-18-71748-ast)</p>	Not Disputed.
2.	<p>Defendant is an active Domestic Limited Liability Company formed under the laws of the State of New York on December 23, 2015.</p> <p>Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶2; See NYS Department of State, Division of Corporations certificate, attached as Exhibit B</p>	Not Disputed.
3.	<p>The Debtor's Constellation Healthcare Technologies maintained a checking account at Manufacturer's Trust Bank, Account #-68132</p> <p>See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶4; See M&T Bank Statements, attached to Affidavit of Daniel Jones as Exhibit A & B.</p>	Not Disputed.

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
4.	<p>On December 23, 2015, Paul Parmar, the chief executive officer ("CEO") of the Debtor CHT ("<u>Parmar</u>"), instructed Sam Zaharis, the chief financial officer ("CFO") of Debtor to transfer \$545,000 by wire from the Debtor's M&T Bank account, to the account of Lustrin Tetelman, LLP., attorneys for Clodagh Bowyer Greene and Elliott Greene (the "Sellers")</p> <p>See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶ 4 referencing Emails dated December 23, 2015 attached to the Affidavit of Daniel Jones, as Exhibit 4.</p>	Not Disputed.
5.	<p>The Seller, Elliott Greene, is the brother of Mitchell Greene, Esq, a partner with Robinson Brog. Mitchell Greene along with his son Adam Greene, also an attorney at Robinson Brog, represented Parmar in acquiring the Condominium Unit.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶5; See emails attached as Exhibit 4, to the Affidavit of Daniel Jones.</p>	Not Disputed.
6.	<p>On December 29, 2015, Parmar's instructed his identity not be revealed by instructing that "Salil and Kiran Sharma" be reflected as the purchasers of the Condominium Unit (as evidenced in the email exchange dated between Parmar, Adam Greene, and Zaharis).</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶7; See Exhibit 4, attached to the Affidavit of Daniel Jones.</p>	Disputed that Parmar was attempting to hide his identity; further Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to any material issue as Salil and Kiran Sharma were not named as purchasers and are not listed on the title or deed.

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
7.	<p>Parmar and Sam Zaharis (“<u>Zaharis</u>”) orchestrated the purchase of the Condominium Unit with funds of the Debtor out of the Debtor’s bank account maintained at M&T Bank. After the deposit for \$545,000 was wired, the remaining balance of the purchase price and closing costs in the amount of \$5,058,408.81 were wired out of the Debtor’s M&T Bank account on February 19, 2016.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶5; See Exhibits 1, 2, and 5, attached to the Affidavit of Daniel Jones; See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶6</p>	Not Disputed that the funds were wired from the Debtor’s M&T bank account at Parmar’s direction; objection to the term “orchestrated.”
8.	<p>The monies were wired into the Debtor’s IOLA account at Robinson Brog and on the same day a cashier’s check cut to the Sellers, Elliott Greene and Clodagh Bowyer.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶6; See Exhibit D, to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan.</p>	Not Disputed that the two transfers took place as described; Defendant contends that the escrow account held other (non-CHT) Parmar funds on that same date so that it cannot be said that the funds for the cashier’s check originated from the M&T bank wire.
9.	<p>Upon purchasing the Condominium Unit in 2016, Parmar occupied the unit with his girlfriend, Defendant Elaine Sartison. , which memorialize Parmar’s discussions with Douglas Elliman Property Management Company and his admission he was occupying the Condominium Unit.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶8; See Exhibit E, emails dated April 12, 2018, attached to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan.</p>	Not Disputed; Defendant however adds that on a routine basis business was also conducted at the Condominium by employees and officers of the Debtor and of CC Capital.

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
10. Parmar asserts he is the manager of Defendant, 2 River Terrace Apartment 12J, LLC. See Objection to Motion for Entry of Default Judgment [Dkt No. 31]; pg. 4.		Not Disputed.

II. Defendant Conducted No Business With The Debtor, Was Owed No Debt By the Debtor, Yet Received Property of the Debtor worth 5.6 MM

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
11. According to the books and records of the Debtor, Defendant performed no service and had no business dealings with the Debtor. See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶6		Disputed in that after the Condominium purchase, the Apartment was used for business meetings and business social functions with outside executives and also CHT / Orion Executives on a regular basis.
12. Parmar was the Chief Executive Officer of the Debtor, Constellation Healthcare Technologies, Inc. See Objection to Motion for Entry of Default Judgment [Dkt No. 31]; pg. 4		Not Disputed.
13. The Debtor's books and records evidence no preexisting debt owed to the Defendant See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶6		Not Disputed as to Defendant 2 River; Defendant references the employment agreement and Consulting Agreement with respect to pending payments and existing debt owed to Defendant's manager Parmar.
14. The Debtor's records evidence no antecedent debt satisfied as a result of the		Not Disputed as to Defendant 2 River; Defendant references the employment

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact	Defendant's Response in Reply
<p>diversion of \$5,603,408.81 in funds from the Debtor's M&T Bank Accounts.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶6.</p>	<p>agreement and Consulting Agreement with respect to pending payments and existing debt owed to Defendant's manager Parmar.</p>

III. The Debtor Was Utilized To Pay For The Upkeep Of The Condominium Unit Until The Debtor's Credit Cards Were Taken Away From Parmar

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact	Defendant's Response in Reply
<p>15. Douglas Elliman Property Management collected payments for common expenses associated with the Condominium Unit.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶10; See, Exhibit G, payment slip to Douglas Elliman Property Management, attached to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan.</p>	<p>Not Disputed.</p>
<p>16. Parmar used his position as CEO to pay not less than \$68,247.19 for upkeep of the Condominium Unit with the Debtor's credit cards</p> <p>See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶7; See Exhibit 3 Ledger of Debtor's credit cards payment history for the American Express Corporate card).</p>	<p>Disputed; Defendant contends the amounts were accounted for/to Parmar in calculating his compensation.</p>
<p>17. Parmar's access to credit cards of the Debtor were unilaterally terminated in late 2017.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶7.</p>	<p>Not Disputed.</p>

IV. Defendant Failed To Pay For Ongoing Taxes, Utilities and Common Area Costs Since February 2018 Resulting in A Judgment in Favor of The Residential Board in Excess of \$200,000

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
18.	<p>Defendant was in default under the covenants with the Residential Board by not paying for taxes, utilities and common charges from February 2018, forward.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶9; See Exhibit F, Judgment of the State of New York; See Exhibit H, Statement of outstanding charges from Douglas Elliman Property Management attached to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan,</p>	Disputed; Defendant was in default from May 2018 onwards but Defendant contends the Residential Board unreasonably barred Defendant and Parmar from the use and enjoyment of the Condominium. Defendant disputes default in the period between February and May 2018.
19.	<p>On September 20, 2019, the Supreme Court of the State of New York entered judgment in the sum of \$200,208.04, in favor of the Residential Board of Managers (“RBM”) as against Defendant and the real property for failure to pay the associated fees and costs for electricity, taxes, and assessments incurred by living in the Condominium Unit.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶9; See Exhibit F, Judgment of the State of New York attached to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan</p>	Not Disputed; but Defendant contends the Residential Board unreasonably barred Defendant and Parmar from the use and enjoyment of the Condominium.
20.	<p>As of October 1, 2020, the RBM is owed not less than \$369,469.96, as Defendant or another has not paid the associated fees and costs for any month since February 1, 2018.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶11; See Exhibit H, Statement of outstanding charges from Douglas Elliman Property</p>	Disputed; Defendant admits the amount of the judgment but contends the loss of utility of the space far outweighs the value being claimed.

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
	Management, attached to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan.	

V. Parmar's Diversion of the Debtor's Funds To Cover His Outstanding Personal Loans

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
21.	<p>In July, 2009, Parmar borrowed \$600,000 from his neighbor Howard Schoor and by 2010, Parmar was in default on the loan.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶¶13-14; See Exhibits J and K attached to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan; See Request For Judicial Notice, Exhibit 2, Complaint, Exhibit A; Dkt. No. 1; Howard M. Ehrenberg v. Howard M. Schoor; Adv. Proc. No. 20-08042</p>	Not admitted or denied; but Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to a material issue.
22.	<p>In January 2017, Parmar directed Zaharis to pay his personal debt to Schoor with monies from the Debtor despite the fact the Debtor had no monies to make payroll.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶15; See Exhibit L, attached to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan; See Request For Judicial Notice, Exhibit 2, Complaint, Exhibit A; Dkt. No. 1; Howard M. Ehrenberg v. Howard M. Schoor; Adv. Proc. No. 20-08042</p>	Not admitted or denied; but Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to a material issue.
23.	<p>On May 20, 2017, Parmar and Zaharis conspired to and did create a fake vendor agreement, invoices and falsified receivables in order to make it appear that</p>	Disputed; but Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to a material issue and cannot admit or deny and as such denies.

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact	Defendant's Response in Reply
<p>Schoor rendered services to the Debtor.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶16; See Exhibit M attached to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan; See Request For Judicial Notice, Exhibit 2, Complaint, Exhibit A; Dkt. No. 1; Howard M. Ehrenberg v. Howard M. Schoor; Adv. Proc. No. 20-08042</p>	
<p>24. As of February 2010, Parmar personally borrowed \$1,000,000 from Mark Feuer (“Feuer”). Parmar was owed not less than \$400,000 as of 2016.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶13; See Exhibit J attached to the Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan; See Request For Judicial Notice, Exhibit 3, Complaint, Exhibit A; Dkt. No. 1; Howard M. Ehrenberg v. Moshe Feuer and Miriam Feuer; Adv. Proc. No. 20-08039</p>	<p>Not admitted or denied; but Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to a material issue.</p>
<p>25. On February 7, 2017, at Parmar’s direction, \$900,000 of the Debtor’s funds were wired to Feuer from the Debtor’s IOLA account at Robinson Brog approximately ½ of which paid back Parmar’s personal loan. (See Request For Judicial Notice, Exhibit 3, Complaint, Exhibit A; Dkt. No. 1; Howard M. Ehrenberg v. Moshe Feuer and Miriam Feuer; Adv. Proc. No. 20-08039).</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶13; See Request For Judicial Notice, Exhibit 3, Complaint, Exhibit A; Dkt. No. 1; Howard M. Ehrenberg v. Moshe Feuer and Miriam Feuer; Adv. Proc. No. 20-08039</p>	<p>Not admitted or denied; but Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to a material issue.</p>

VI. The Debtors Recorded Consecutive Losses Each Year From 2015 To The Petition Date And Had Negative Cumulative Earnings of -\$133,398,156, As of December 31, 2017

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
26.	<p>FTI Consulting, Inc. (“FTI”) was appointed in September 2017 to conduct a forensic examination of the Debtors’ business following questions raised as to CHT’s financial condition.</p> <p>See Declaration of Timothy J. Dragelin ¶75, See Request for Judicial Notice; Exhibit 1, Declaration, Dkt. No. 2; In re Orion Healthcorp, Inc.</p>	Not Disputed.
27.	<p>Timothy J. Dragelin served as the Debtors’ CEO and CRO shortly after the resignation of executives Parmar, and termination of Sam Zaharis, and Ravi Chivukula on September 29, 2017, and through the filing of the Petition, restructuring and sale of the Debtors’ assets.</p> <p>See Declaration of Timothy J. Dragelin ¶¶77-82; See Request for Judicial Notice; Exhibit 1, Declaration, Dkt. No. 2; In re Orion Healthcorp, Inc.</p>	Not Disputed.
28.	<p>On September, 16, 2015, the Debtor CHT acquired <i>Phoenix Health, LLC</i> for 14.0 million, and acquired its business. However, Phoenix had no business, assets or employees and was a fictitious entity.</p> <p>See Declaration of Timothy J. Dragelin, pgs. 10-11; 30-32, ¶¶ 23, 90, 94, 95; See Request for Judicial Notice; Exhibit 1, Declaration, Dkt. No. 2; In re Orion Healthcorp, Inc.</p>	Disputed; but Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to a material issue and cannot admit or deny and as such denies.

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
29.	<p>On September, 18, 2015, the Debtor CHT acquired <i>Northstar Acquisition, LLC</i> for 18.0 million, and acquired its business. However, Phoenix had no business, assets or employees and was a fictitious entity.</p> <p>See Declaration of Timothy J. Dragelin, pgs. 10-11; 30-31, ¶¶ 23, 90, 92 and 93; See Request for Judicial Notice; Exhibit 1, Declaration, Dkt. No. 2; In re Orion Healthcorp, Inc.</p>	Disputed; but Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to a material issue and cannot admit or deny and as such denies.
30.	<p>The Debtor's filed an Amended US Corporation Income Tax Return for tax year ending 2015, restating revenue to evidence a net operating loss of -\$11,392,467 for the year. The Debtors' retained cumulative earnings, or Cumulative Income, was -94,135,177 as of December 31, 2015.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶11; See Form 1120, 2015 Amended Tax Return, line 30; attached to Affidavit of Daniel Jones; See Form 1120, 2015 Amended Tax Return, Schedule L, line 25; attached as Exhibit 7 to Affidavit of Daniel Jones.</p>	Not Disputed; but Defendant objects to the fact and the significance to any material issue, as the same set of financial facts can look different through different treatment of amortizable expenses.
31.	<p>The Debtor's filed a US Corporation Income Tax Return for tax year ending 2016, evidencing a net operating loss for 2016 of -39,007,282. For 2016, the Debtors' retained cumulative income (loss) was -112,905,441</p> <p>See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶12; See Form 1120, 2016 US Corporation Income Tax Return, line 30; attached to Affidavit of Daniel Jones); See Form 1120, 2016 Federal Income Tax Return, Schedule L, line 25, attached as Exhibit 8 to Affidavit of Daniel Jones.</p>	Not Disputed; but Defendant objects to the fact and the significance to any material issue, as the same set of financial facts can look different through different treatment of amortizable expenses.

Plaintiff's Statement of Fact		Defendant's Response in Reply
32.	<p>On February 10, 2016, CHT acquired MDRX Medical Billing, LLC ("MDRX") for 28MM.</p> <p>See Declaration of Timothy Dragelin, page 11; ¶ 26; See Request for Judicial Notice; Exhibit 1, Declaration, Dkt. No. 2; In re Orion Healthcorp, Inc.</p>	Disputed; but Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to a material issue and cannot admit or deny and as such denies.
33.	<p>MDRX had no assets, employees, conducted no business and was a sham transaction with fake revenue</p> <p>See Declaration of Timothy Dragelin, page 11, 30; ¶¶ 26, 90, 98); See Request for Judicial Notice; Exhibit 1, Declaration, Dkt. No. 2; In re Orion Healthcorp, Inc.</p>	Disputed; but Defendant objects to the fact as having no relevance to a material issue and cannot admit or deny and as such denies.
34.	<p>The Debtor's filed its US Corporation Income Tax Return for tax year ending 2017, stating a net income (loss) for 2017 of -\$20,492,714. As of 2017, the Debtor carried a Cumulative Income (loss) of -\$133,398,156</p> <p>See Affidavit of Daniel Jones, ¶13; US Corporation Income Tax Return for 2017, Form 1120, Schedule M-3, line 4; See Form 1120, 2017 Tax Return, Schedule L, pg. 141, line 25; attached to Affidavit of Daniel Jones as Exhibit 9)</p>	Not Disputed; but Defendant objects to the fact and the significance to any material issue, as the same set of financial facts can look different through different treatment of amortizable expenses.
35.	<p>On December 16, 2015, the Southern District Court of Texas issued a Judgment in the amount of \$194,185, against the Debtors in favor of former employees Jack McBride and Alan Nottingham for unpaid deferred compensation. The Judgment was</p>	Not Disputed.

	<p>filed as a proof of claim in Case 8-18-71748, and assigned claim no. 10001. The filed claim remains unsatisfied.</p> <p>See Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan, ¶4, See Exhibit C. referencing the filed claim attached to Affidavit of Jeffrey Nolan</p>	
--	--	--

Defendants Separate Statement of Facts

Defendant Statement of Fact	Plaintiff's Response in Reply
A Defendant is an active Domestic Limited Liability Company formed under the laws of the State of New York on December 23, 2015. Division of Corporations certificate, Plaintiff's Exhibit B	Not Disputed.
B. Parmar was owed \$650,000 annual salary plus bonuses calculated from EBITDA each year commencing in June 2013 and continuing up to and after the subject purchase in 2016. First United Health, LLC consulting agreement, attached as Defendant's Exhibit 1	Disputed; The fact is without foundation, evidentiary support and is the argument of counsel. The attached consulting agreement states FUH, not Parmar, will receive salary and potentially a bonus on a formula consisting of "EBITA" not EBITDA, less the amount of all funding obtained. (Section 2.1) No supporting documents were introduced into evidence to calculate what, if any, amount was due by non-debtor Constellation Health, LLC to FUH such that Plaintiff cannot agree any amount "was owed" to FUH and no documents were introduced into evidence to determine if "Parmar was owed" any amount by FUH. (See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)

Defendant Statement of Fact	Plaintiff's Response in Reply
<p>C. EBITDA totaled in the millions in both 2014 and 2015, with annual increases.</p> <p>Excerpt from CHT Board Meeting Notes, attached as Defendant's Exhibit 2</p>	<p>Disputed; there is no foundation for Exhibit 2, a single page document, and the document references EBITDA, not EBITA.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>
<p>D. CHT went public on the London AIM in 2014; part of the process included ratification and publication of Parmar's compensation under the consulting agreement.</p> <p>Admission to the AIM public document, attached as Defendant's Exhibit 3</p>	<p>Disputed; there is no foundation for Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 3 contradicts Exhibit 1 in material respects; the consulting agreement allegedly referenced in Exhibit 3 references a consulting agreement with FUH that limits any bonus to "up to \$175,000, payable at the discretion of the board". (See Exhibit 3, Section 6.1)</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>
<p>E. In 2014, Parmar elected to receive his bonus in shares and was not paid in cash; the bonus was not disputed by the board and was ratified.</p> <p>Consent of the Board; attached as Defendant's Exhibit 4</p>	<p>Disputed; there is no foundation for Exhibit 4. Exhibit 4 states FUH, not Parmar, elected to receive B-2 Units rather than cash.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>
<p>F. As of June 2015, the bonus due to Parmar under the consulting contract with FUH was in excess of 9 million dollars.</p> <p>Warrant dilution calculations dated June 26, 2015; attached as Defendant's Exhibit 5</p>	<p>Disputed; The fact is without foundation, evidentiary support, and is the argument of counsel. No evidence has been introduced that (a) a bonus in any amount was due to FUH, (b) Parmar was entitled to or paid by FUH, or (c) the Debtor accrued a liability.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>

Defendant Statement of Fact		Plaintiff's Response in Reply
G.	<p>The Debtor maintained multiple bank accounts, including a checking account at Manufacturer's Trust Bank, account #-68132.</p> <p>This fact is acknowledged by Plaintiff's Statement of Facts 3</p>	Not Disputed.
H.	<p>On December 23, 2015, the Debtor transferred \$545,000 from the M&T Bank Account by wire to the account of Lustrin Tetelman, LLP, attorneys for the Sellers of Apartment 12J. The transfer was made on Parmar's behalf as part of the funds owed him under the FUH contract.</p> <p>The fact of this transfer is acknowledged in Plaintiff's Statement of Facts 4</p>	Not Disputed as to the first sentence. As to the second sentence, Plaintiff objects as the statement is the argument of counsel without evidentiary support. Plaintiff admits the Transfer in question was made for the benefit Parmar, but no documentary evidence or sworn testimony supports any rationale for the funds or Condominium Unit being taken pursuant to any contract for compensation.
I	<p>At the time of the purchase of Apartment 12J, the law firm of Robinson Brog represented the Debtor and maintained an escrow account already holding funds on the Debtor's behalf. Robinson Brog also represented FUH and Parmar, and prepared the LLC paperwork forming Defendant 2 River.</p> <p>See Plaintiff's Statement of Facts 8, Exhibit D to the Nolan Affidavit, and Plaintiff's Exhibit B</p>	Plaintiff does Not Dispute that the law firm of Robinson Brog represented the Debtor or that Robinson Brog prepared the LLC paperwork forming Defendant 2 River. No evidentiary foundation exists for the remainder of the statement.

Defendant Statement of Fact		Plaintiff's Response in Reply
J	<p>On February 19, 2016, the Debtor transferred \$5,058,408.81 from the M&T Bank Account to the IOLA account maintained by Robinson Brog. This sum constituted the closing costs required for the purchase of Apartment 12J as well as a majority of the bonus owed to FUH for Parmar's services as CEO of the Debtor. Robinson Brog's IOLA account held other funds on behalf of the various entities it represented. The closing took place on that same date with funds from Robinson Brog's IOLA account.</p> <p>See Defendant's Exhibit 1, Plaintiff's Statement of Facts 7 and 8.</p>	<p>Not Disputed as to the first sentence. With respect to the second sentence, Plaintiff agrees that the \$5,058,408.81 constituted the closing costs required for the purchase of Apartment 12J and was deposited on the same day it was removed from the M&T bank account into the escrow account. The statement of Defendant that the monies were validly diverted by Parmar as a bonus owed to FUH, or Robinson Brog's IOLA account held other funds for other entities lacks foundation, evidentiary support, and is the argument of counsel.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>
K	<p>Defendant 2 River purchased Apartment 12J from Clodagh Bowyer Greene and Elliott Greene.</p> <p>See Plaintiff's Statement of Facts 5</p>	Not Disputed.
L	<p>Throughout the year 2016 and for a substantial portion of 2017, Parmar continued in his role as CEO of Constellation. As part of this role, Parmar carried a corporate credit card issued in his name.</p> <p>Plaintiff's Exhibit 3, payment history for American Express Corporate Card issued in Parmar's name; Defendant's Exhibits 1 and 9</p>	Not Disputed.


Defendant Statement of Fact		Plaintiff's Response in Reply
M	<p>Throughout the year 2016, the Debtor engaged in negotiations with Chinh Chu and CC Capital leading up to a transaction that took the Debtor off the London AIM in January of 2017. The Go Private process required a significant financial outlay by the Debtor of both cash and personnel resources.</p> <p>Defendant's Exhibit 10, excerpt from funds flow do</p>	<p>Disputed; The fact is without foundation, evidentiary support and is the argument of counsel.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>
N	<p>In 2016, the Debtor acquired Allegiance Consulting Associates, LLC and Allegiance Billing & Consulting, LLC for a combined purchase price of \$4,776,000.</p> <p>Defendant's Exhibit 6, Closing statement for ABC/ACA acquisition</p>	<p>Disputed; The fact is without foundation, evidentiary support and is the argument of counsel.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>
O	<p>In June of 2016, the Debtor paid in excess of \$18 million to pay off principal debt, pay pre-payment fees, and buy back outstanding options.</p> <p>Defendant's Exhibit 7, Loan Warrant Settlement</p>	<p>Disputed; The fact is without foundation, evidentiary support and is the argument of counsel.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>
P	<p>Throughout the months immediately following the purchase of Apartment 12J, the Debtor maintained a healthy cash flow through its primary operating account at JP Morgan Chase.</p> <p>Defendant's Exhibit 8, redacted full statement for March 2016 and redacted summary pages through June 2016</p>	<p>Disputed; The fact is without foundation, evidentiary support and is the argument of counsel.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>

Defendant Statement of Fact		Plaintiff's Response in Reply
Q	<p>As part of the Go Private transaction, a new consulting agreement was prepared maintaining Parmar as the CEO.</p> <p>Defendant's Exhibit 9, Consulting agreement between CHT Holdco and Parmar</p>	<p>Disputed; The fact is without foundation, evidentiary support and is the argument of counsel.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>
R	<p>At the closing of the Go Private transaction, the Debtor contributed \$5 million in cash from available reserves.</p> <p>Defendant's Exhibit 10, redacted excerpt from funds flow at closing</p>	<p>Disputed; The fact is without foundation, evidentiary support and is the argument of counsel.</p> <p>(See Motion To Strike And Evidentiary Objections To Exhibits In Support Of Defendant's Opposition, filed concurrently)</p>

Dated: January 6, 2021

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

By:



Ilan D. Scharf, Esq.
 Jeffrey P. Nolan, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 780 Third Avenue, 34th Floor
 New York, New York 10017
 Telephone: (212) 561-7700
 Facsimile: (212) 561-7777

Counsel for the Plaintiff,
 Howard M. Ehrenberg in his capacity as
 Liquidating Trustee of Orion Healthcorp, Inc.,
et al.

Dated: January 6, 2021

PARLATORE LAW GROUP, LLP

By:



Maryam N. Hadden, Esq.
One World Trade Center, Suite 8500
New York, New York 10007
Telephone: (646)846-6382

Counsel for Defendant, 2 River Terrace, Apt.
12J, LLC